

DOUBLE NUMBER, PRICE 3s.

The CLASSICAL QUARTERLY and CLASSICAL REVIEW are the Organs of the Classical Association. The QUARTERLY is published in January, April, July, and October; the REVIEW in the other eight months.

The Classical Review

EDITORS { J. T. SHEPPARD, M.A., Litt.D., King's College, Cambridge.
{ R. W. LIVINGSTONE, M.A., Corpus Christi College, Oxford.

Board of Management:

Prof. R. R. CONWAY, Litt.D., F.B.A., Chairman.

Prof. J. F. DODSON, M.A., Hon. Treasurer.

Prof. A. G. CLARE, Litt.D., F.B.A., Hon. Secretary.

Prof. GILBERT MURRAY, Litt.D., D.Litt., F.R.A., F.R.S.L. With the Chairman, Treasurer, and Secretary, representing the Council of the Classical Association.

A. D. GODLEY, D.Litt., Representing the Oxford Philological Society.
Prof. SIR WILLIAM RIDGEWAY, D.Litt., Litt.D., Sc.D., LL.D., F.R.A., Representing the Cambridge Philological Society.

With the co-operation of Prof. WM. GARDNER HALE, University of Chicago;

Prof. MAURICE HUTTON, University of Toronto;

Prof. T. G. TUCKER, Litt.D., Melbourne.

Vol. XXXVI

FEBRUARY-MARCH, 1922

Nos. 1/2

CONTENTS

	PAGE	REVIEWS—continued:	PAGE
EDITORIAL NOTES AND NEWS	1	Latin Phonetics (Juret). W. M. LINDSAY	25
SAPPHO'S ODE TO APHRODITE. ALEXANDER W. LAWRENCE	2	Plotinus (Mackenna). W. R. INGE	26
THE PRIME MINISTER'S COMMITTEE AGAIN	3	The <i>Oedipus Tyrannus</i> of Sophocles (Sheppard). GILBERT NORWOOD	27
THE PRELUDE OF THE <i>Agamemnon</i> . J. T. SHEPPARD	5	Eracrito (Macchioro). A. W. PICKARD-CAMBRIDGE	30
THE DITHYRAMB—AN ANATOLIAN DIRGE. W. M. CALDER	11	Public Libraries and Literary Culture in Ancient Rome (Boyd). F. W. HALL	31
Homeric Hymn to Hermes 109 f. H. P. CHOLMELEY	14	Die Entstehung und Religiöse Bedeutung des Griechischen Kalenders (Nilsson). F. M. C.	32
Lua Mater: Fire, Rust, and War in Early Roman Cult. H. J. ROSE	15	La Loi de Hiéron et les Romains (Carcopino). F. DE ZULUETA	33
Aeschylus, <i>Prometheus Vinctus</i> BoI. MARGARET E. HIRST	18	Die Hellenistischen Mysterienreligionen (Reitzenstein). G. W. BUTTERWORTH	34
Greek Etymologies: ἄρπη, λύπη, καρδιά, φίνος, χαλκός. A. H. SAVAGE	19	Martial and other Essays (Smith). J. WIGHT DUFF	35
Professor Housman on Greek Astrology. V. V. RAMANA-SÄSTRIN	20	The Alexandra of Lycophron (Mooney). E. A. BARBER	36
'Satires Tota Nostra Est.' W. RENNIE	21	Germanische Urgeschichte (Norden). H. STUART JONES	38
Proprie Communia Dicere. R. L. DUNDABIN	21	A Great Inheritance (Conway). A. S. OWEN	39
REVIEWS:		Manuel d'Archéologie Romaine (Chapot). F. N. PRYCE	41
Greeks and Barbarians (Thomson). T. R. GLOVER	22	SHORT NOTICES	41-44
The Foundations of Classic Architecture (Warren). D. S. ROBERTSON	23	CORRESPONDENCE	45
Homeric Greek: A Book for Beginners (Pharr). FRANK CARTER	24	SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS	45
		BOOKS RECEIVED	45

(The Editors request that books for review be sent, not to them direct, but to the Publishers.)

LONDON: JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET, W.
NEW YORK: G. E. STECHERT & CO., 151-155, WEST 25TH STREET.

Price for Single Numbers, 1s. 6d. net. Yearly Subscription, 12s. net, post free; U.S.A. \$3.
Combined Yearly Subscription for the CLASSICAL QUARTERLY and the CLASSICAL REVIEW
25s. net, post free; U.S.A. \$6.25.

THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION

THE objects of the Classical Association are to promote the development and maintain the well-being of classical studies, and in particular (a) to impress upon public opinion the claim of such studies to an eminent place in the national scheme of education; (b) to improve the practice of classical teaching; (c) to encourage investigation and call attention to new discoveries; (d) to create opportunities for intercourse among lovers of classical learning.

Membership of the Association is open to men and women alike. The annual subscription is 5s. (life composition, £3 15s.), and there is an entrance fee of 5s. (not charged to Libraries). Members receive a copy of the annual *Proceedings* of the Association and, on payment of 2s. 6d., of *The Year's Work in Classical Studies* (both post free). They may also obtain the *Classical Review* and *Classical Quarterly* at reduced prices, provided that the subscriptions be paid before January 3rd in each year. Subscriptions sent in later than that date must be at the rates offered to the general public.

Inquiries and applications for membership should be addressed to the Hon. Treasurer, Mr. H. A. Ormerod, 7, Grosvenor Terrace, Princes Park, Liverpool; or to either of the Hon. Secretaries, Professor Pearson, Etonfield, King's Gap, Hoylake, Cheshire, and Rev. G. C. Richards, Oriel College, Oxford; or to the Hon. Secretary of any of the district Branches—viz., Miss Hilda Livesey, 155, Oswald Road, Chorlton-cum-Hardy, near Manchester; Miss Margaret Hooker, Secondary School for Girls, Erdington, Birmingham; Mr. H. A. Ormerod, The University, Liverpool; Mr. E. P. Barker, 426, Woodborough Road, Nottingham; Miss P. K. Downes, Redland High School, Bristol; Mr. Basil Anderton, The Public Library, New Bridge Street, Newcastle-upon-Tyne; Miss C. E. Parker, Westfield College, Hampstead; Miss M. E. Pearson, University Registry, Cathays Park, Cardiff; Mr. E. E. Bibby, The University, Leeds; Miss M. L. Newman, 7, College Street, Sheffield; Mr. E. D. T. Jenkins, University College, Aberystwyth; Mr. J. Whatmough, University College, Bangor; Miss M. G. Colman, High School, Tunbridge Wells; and Mr. W. K. Macintosh, 90, Banbury Road, Oxford.

FISHING FROM THE EARLIEST TIMES

By WILLIAM RADCLIFFE

SOMETIME OF BALLIOL COLLEGE, OXFORD

DR. J. W. MACKAIL in a letter in
"The Times Literary Supplement" says:

"Perhaps I may say that when I was translating the 'Odyssey' myself I came to the conclusion, with some doubt, that the harpoon was meant, the ox-horn being the detachable horn tip of the lance, and rendered the passage accordingly. But after studying the careful and scholarly discussion of the whole matter in Mr. Radcliffe's book I incline to think that I was wrong. It is far from being the only instance in which by applying care, common sense and expert knowledge, Mr. Radcliffe has thrown valuable light on the classics. His book will, I think, be in some sense a classic itself; it ought to be in every scholar's as well as in every angler's library."

Of this volume 264 pages are devoted to Greek and Roman Fishing from Homer to Ausonius. The Author treats of its methods, superstitions, taboos, laws, medicine, folk-lore, gods. He makes several original points, e.g., the establishment of Aristotle as the *first* reader of the ages of fish by their scales and the (probable) use of the artificial fly centuries before *Elian* described it.

A handsome volume, artistically bound,
with numerous illustrations. 28/- net.

JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET, LONDON, W. 1.

i
s
l
o
e
d
i
s
l
e
t
l
;
o
e
b
r
e
;
1
2
y
2
5
3
0



The Classical Review

FEBRUARY—MARCH, 1922

EDITORIAL NOTES AND NEWS

IN the September number we recorded with deep regret the death of Dr. Warde Fowler, which was a personal loss to nearly every Latin scholar in this country, and was so felt by the wide circle of students who had learnt from his writings something of his gracious personality. The conditions which sternly limit the size of this *Review* still forbid us to publish a biography worthy of his work and influence. Sympathetic notices will be found in *The Times* and in the *Manchester Guardian* of June 16, 1921. But some further acknowledgment should be made in this *Review* of the service which he rendered to Classical scholarship, and we print a few lines written at our request by his friend, Professor R. S. Conway, who was closely associated with much of his later work:

In the wide field of modern Classical study at home and abroad Warde Fowler's contribution was characteristic and unique. Other scholars have studied minutely the monuments and traditions of early Italy and Greece, and have provided a mass of information on the history of religious and political institutions. Following the same impulse, Warde Fowler devoted many years to studying the *City State of the Greeks and Romans* (1893), and the details of the *Roman Festivals of the Republican Period* (1899), a book which had much in common with the work of Mommsen at its best. But in Warde Fowler, the born naturalist and lover of humanity inspired and completed the learning of the scholar, and carried him beyond the details of research to a task in which Mommsen's genius had conspicuously failed; and he thus produced what will be more and more acknowledged as the greatest historical synthesis made in our time. Three original and striking books—*Social Life at Rome in the Age of Cicero* (1908), *The Religious Experience of the Roman People* (1911), and *Roman Ideas of Deity* (1914)—created for the first time in the history of scholarship a convincing picture of the social and ethical growth of the people of Rome. For them he vindicated once for all the possession of a native and sincere religion, in no mean sense of that long-suffering word. However familiar the incident or the institution which he handled (though he handled also a multitude of discoveries), his treatment was always fresh. He looked at what the Romans did, and he taught us to look, from the inside of the Roman mind. His

synthesis, therefore, was also a profound interpretation; and it was not surprising that the aftermath of his harvest should take the form of three or four volumes of penetrating and genial comment on his favourite Latin poet. *Virgil's Gathering of the Clans* (1916), *Aeneas at the Site of Rome* (1917), *The Death of Turnus* (1919), not to mention his share in a small volume (1907) on the problem of *Virgil's Messianic Eclogue* (in 1907), brought a note of simple and unaffected poetic appreciation into the too conventional world of Virgilian scholarship; and these books, with his collection of *Roman Essays and Interpretations* (1920), and his last paper (also in 1920¹) on the *Imagination of the Romans*, made a natural close to the chief work of his life, a clear-sighted but loving study of the contribution of ancient Rome to the growth of humanity.

The Annual General Meeting of the Classical Association was held at the City of London School from Thursday, January 5, to Saturday, the 7th. Lord Milner's presidential address was felicitous in expression and lofty in tone. A vote of thanks to him was moved by Mr. Asquith, the most distinguished living *alumnus* of the City of London School, and seconded by Lord Chalmers, also a former pupil of the school under Dr. Abbott. The object-lesson was impressive. Here were three distinguished public servants who not only acknowledged the debt they themselves owed to a classical education, but in these days, in which it is so much decried, emphasised its value in the rebuilding of civilisation after the shock of the war, and the indestructible vitality of the legacy of Greece and Rome.

The archaeological side of classical studies was emphasised by two lecturers. Professor Droop lectured on the Roman Forum; and Professor Théodore Reinach, of Paris, ingeniously argued that the famous 'Sophocles' of the Lateran was really a copy of a statue to Solon erected in Salamis, and the work of Cephisodotus, the father (or the elder

¹ It formed his Presidential Address to the Classical Association at Newcastle (*C. A. Proceedings*, XVII, 1920).

brother) of Praxiteles. Most interesting papers were read by Professor Platt, who argued that the primitive childlike element was more conspicuous in the form of Greek Tragedy than is usually allowed; by Mr. Cyril Bailey, who did full justice to the loftiness of Lucretius' religion; and by Mr. Norman Baynes on the teaching of Roman history. The resolutions arising out of the recommendations of the Prime Minister's Committee are printed elsewhere in this number of the *Review*.

The Association will meet at Bristol in April, 1923, when Dr. Mackail will deliver the Presidential Address.

We desire to associate ourselves with the congratulations and good wishes which are being offered to Professor Gildersleeve on his ninetieth birthday.

It may be remembered that in our last number we printed an appeal from

Dr. Sonnenschein for subscriptions for the relief of Classical teachers in German and Austrian Universities. Just after going to press we received a report and a letter, signed by Lord Bryce, Sir F. Kenyon, and other well-known scholars, on behalf of the Universities' Committee of the Imperial War Relief Fund, pointing out the urgent need for help in the Universities, particularly of Austria and Russia:

The average Viennese professor, with wife and children, draws but the equivalent of £40 to £60 per year to maintain himself and his family. From the Armistice to the end of last year—i.e., 1920—one-tenth of the professors and lecturers of Austria died, largely as a result of want, starvation, and consequent disease.

Cheques should be made payable to the Hon. Treasurer, Universities' Committee, and sent to the Organising Secretary, Miss Eleonora Iredale, at Fishmongers' Hall, London Bridge, E.C. 4.

SAPPHO'S ODE TO APHRODITE.

RAINBOW-THONED daughter of Zeus,
immortal
Aphrodite, mighty enchantress, hear
me;
Break not, gracious Lady, my heart
with cruel
Scorn and derision.

Nay but haste thee hither, as once
aforetime
Prayer of mine thou heardest afar and
hearing
Straight thy Father's golden abode
forsaking
Hither thou camest

In thy wingèd chariot. Lovely sparrows
Through the vault of heaven with
whirring pinions
Bore thee fleeting over the earth's dark
furrows
Eagerly onward.

And right swiftly did they arrive beside
me;
Then my Lady's lips in a smile immortal

Bade me tell what pitiful wrongs betide
me,
Wherefore I call her;

Saying 'Tell the burden of all thy
sorrows,
Poor distracted bosom, and all thou
cravest.
Who defies my majesty? Who, my
Sappho,
Doth thee dishonour?

One who flees shall verily turn pursuer;
One who spurneth gifts shall be fain to
give them;
One who loves not, verily soon shall love
thee.
Even unwilling.'

Haste thee now once more to my sorrow-
laden
Soul, thou sweet ally of the broken-
hearted;
All the heart's desire of a love-lorn
maiden
Goddess accomplish.

ALEXANDER W. LAWRENCE.

THE PRIME MINISTER'S COMMITTEE AGAIN.

In continuing our reports on the attitude of our readers and of classical teachers generally to this document, we have first to call attention to a series of resolutions passed, after discussion, by the Classical Association at the London Meeting :

1. 'That the Association recommends that Latin be a normal subject of the curriculum in all schools providing Secondary education.'

'But in making this recommendation it desires that no obstacle should be put in the way of pupils learning Greek as their one classical language, and strongly supports the recommendation of the Prime Minister's Committee that "in all curricula of Secondary Schools and Universities, where only Latin is at present allowed, Greek should, wherever possible, be allowed as an alternative."

2. 'That, in the opinion of the Association, the future of Classics in the schools of this country rests mainly with the Headmasters and the Headmistresses, and that a corresponding responsibility lies on them for carrying the recommendations of the Prime Minister's Committee into effect.'

3. 'That the Association recommends that, since a knowledge of Greek is a desirable qualification for the efficient teaching of Latin, as far as possible in appointments to such teaching posts, preference should be given to those who have a knowledge of Greek.'

4. 'That the Association, while recognising the temporary reasons for which the system of Advanced Courses was established, and the stimulus which it has given to higher education, and while welcoming for its own sake the establishment of the new D Courses enabling Latin (or Greek) with English (or a modern foreign language) and the history relevant to both to be the substance of a recognised Advanced Course, nevertheless hopes that it may soon be possible to transform that system into one under which special State aid shall be given in respect of all the approved higher work of any school.'

5. 'That the Association recommends that Latin be retained or reinstated (as the case may be) as a necessary preliminary to or subject in all Arts Courses at the Universities.'

6. 'That the Association wishes to emphasise the recommendation of the Prime Minister's Committee for increased provision of Classical Scholarships at modern Universities, and especially of Entrance Scholarships, in view of the keen competition which exists for such scholarships when offered.'

7. 'That the Association strongly supports the recommendation of the Prime Minister's Committee that (1) the Civil Service Commissioners be asked to reconsider their regulations for admission to the Home Civil Service (Class I.) and the Indian Civil Service, and that (2) the forthcoming regulations for admission to the Clerical Class of the Civil Service should

allow candidates to offer two languages (ancient or modern) other than English.'

Next, we are glad to be able to print a summary, prepared for us by Mr. Ormerod, Treasurer of the Association, of the general conclusions arrived at in a discussion held at Liverpool:

Discussions of the Report in Liverpool have shown that in order eventually to give effect to the recommendations of the Committee as a whole it is necessary to concentrate for the present mainly on Latin, to make its position in the schools impregnable, the whole future of the Classics depending on its maintenance. Apart from dependence on the goodwill of Headmasters, the most effective of direct methods at the present time can only be increased insistence on its study at the Universities and the demand for a higher standard of matriculation.

It is scarcely possible at the present time to hope for anything similar in the case of Greek, largely owing to the practical difficulty, which would at once be felt, of lack of teachers. Both from the point of view of the improvement of Latin teaching and in order to create a supply of teachers of Greek, it was agreed that it is essential that all principal teachers of Latin should be required to possess a knowledge of Greek, even if that knowledge on appointment did not imply more than an ability to teach the elements of grammar and syntax. The adoption of such a course is practicable at the present time, in that many of the Universities are offering Honours courses in Latin with subsidiary Greek. Its adoption would provide at least for elementary instruction in Greek at the schools, and go far to meet the difficulties which are likely to be raised by any proposal to enforce a system of transference of pupils. It is to be hoped, moreover, that many of the more promising pupils would in this way be induced to take up Greek during the last year or two of school. A serious difficulty in the way of the new Honours Latin course with subsidiary Greek is the fact that many students who have a good knowledge of Latin are disinclined to take the Honours course, since in many cases it entails beginning Greek at the University. Practical experience has shown this to be a real difficulty; it would disappear if Greek could be begun even in the last year of school.

The need was emphasised of more Entrance Scholarships at the Universities, to be definitely awarded in Classics. It was pointed out that candidates for Senior City and State Scholarships, to whom a scholarship is a necessity, are at the present time inclined to avoid Greek on the ground that it is more difficult to obtain a scholarship when offering that subject, than, for example, when offering geography or a similar subject, owing to the fact that whereas Greek (in the Girls' Schools at any rate) can hardly be begun before the first school examina-

tion is over, the papers in the H.S.C. of the Joint Matriculation Board are as difficult and the standard of marking as high as in other subjects. The result is that Greek is less frequently offered, and accordingly less studied in the schools.

Throughout the discussions teachers of the Classics were agreed that any compulsion, threatened or implied, was likely to raise opposition which would prove damaging to the position as a whole. More effective and more permanent results are likely to be achieved if the co-operation of Headmasters and Head-mistresses is secured, than by any form of compulsion, whether exercised by the Educational Authorities or the Universities.

Professor Ure, of Reading, sends us the following important criticism :

My chief criticism of the Report is that it champions Greek in so half-hearted a way (pp. 11, 53, 90). Its attitude is sufficiently explained when it says (p. 72) that 'from the actual circumstances and past traditions of English education it is certain that, where one ancient language is taken in the Modern Studies Advanced Courses it will generally be Latin.' This seems to me to misunderstand altogether the direction in which events are moving. If we are to avoid the catastrophe of a purely modern education it is first and foremost Greek that will save the situation (*cf.* the Report itself, pp. 121, 123).

As regards immediate policy the Report is too much inclined to be all things to all men (*e.g.* pp. 70, 25, on Latin for medical students). The failure of very young beginners in Latin to make any real progress in two or even three years (pp. 118, 170) is set against the evidence as to what may be learnt by older boys and girls in a similar period (p. 122).

It is a blow to many of us to find the Report speaking in so uncertain a voice about the value of a course where Latin is begun at thirteen and Greek at sixteen. At the new Universities if only we could get a steady flow of students entering as well equipped as such a course implies, Classics would flourish among us exceedingly, and the reaction on the schools that feed us would not be long delayed.

One cause of this half-hearted attitude is that the Report undervalues the mental discipline to be got from simply reading a really foreign language like Greek or Latin quite apart from exercises in translation and composition (see pp. 10, 83, 151). The value of reading is well put on p. 147, but the rest of the Report ignores this particular page.

The method for so doing is suggested by the Committee, but they do not go far enough in applying it (p. 72). It is simply that Greek and Latin should boldly claim their proper places in advanced modern studies. This might be done in two ways. One (mildly suggested in the Report, p. 54) is to demand Greek and

Latin of a fairly advanced standard at a preliminary examination for intending Honours students in English, and either Greek or Latin for intending Honours students in French or History. The other is to make courses in Greek or Latin (or both in the case of aspirants for Honours in English) integral parts of the Honours courses in these modern subjects. Much might be urged in favour of either proceeding, and still more, especially under present circumstances, in support of a combination of the two. Definite proposals, however, require too much detailed discussion to be dealt with here.

Beyond that we need greater facilities to enable late beginners to continue classical studies after graduation. This need and the ways to meet it are put admirably in the Report (pp. 182-3, 185-7).

We regret that we have not space to print a long letter in defence of the 'Direct Method' of teaching Latin, sent us by Miss M. F. Moor, who speaks with a teacher's experience. We quote, however, her conclusion :

A teacher who knows and loves Latin will be successful by whatever methods he obtains his results ; one great point in favour of direct methods is that they make the teacher know and love the work, and that they are incompatible with the 'dead-alive' atmosphere of a badly taught class.

Finally, if anyone doubts the gravity of the present position, we commend to him the following extract from a letter written by Mr. J. C. Nicol, the Headmaster of Portsmouth Grammar School, a school which has trained some really distinguished classical men :

My short experience of an advanced course in mathematics and science is that where a school is unable to run a Classical course as well, Greek will disappear and Latin will deteriorate. Hitherto I have managed to keep both going, being a classical man myself, and the school has turned out every few years a classical scholar. Even those boys in the VIth, who did no Greek, went on with their Latin, often because they liked it, till they were seventeen or eighteen.

Now, as soon as they have passed the first school examination, they drop their Latin, and I find my Latin Form this term shorn of nearly all the good boys who are staying on for the advanced course in mathematics and science.

If my successor, as is quite probable, is not a classical man, Greek is almost certain to go, and Latin will not be carried beyond matriculation standard.

THE PRELUDE OF THE AGAMEMNON.

I.

CLYTAEMNESTRA'S 'OLOLUGMOS.'

'GOD send an end of troubles,'¹ prays the Watchman, and the beacon seems to answer him. Yet something stops his rejoicing. 'The House, if it could find a voice, would tell a tale. . . .' Clytaemnestra's Oolugmos from the Palace is the answer.²

Aeschylus is working on a hint from Homer.³ The women raised the sacred Oolugmos over the victim sacrificed by Nestor to Athene, as the manifest protector of Telemachus. Penelope, in her chamber, sacrificed and prayed and raised the Oolugmos to Athene. The suitors heard it, and made uproar in the hall. They said, 'The Queen is preparing for marriage. She does not know we mean to kill her son.' They were to die themselves. In the sequel, when the suitors had all been killed, Eurykleia, 'seeing the bodies and the plenteous blood,' was eager to cry Halleluia (ολολύζειν). Odysseus stopped her: οὐχ ὅσιν κταμένουσι ἐπ' ἀνδράσιν εὐχετάσθαι. χαίροιτ' ἀν εἰ χαίροιτ'—έγώ δ' ἐπειχόμαται, says Clytaemnestra.⁴

But Aeschylus develops the theme. As the *Agamemnon* begins with the Watchman's prayer at night, with the beacons, and with Clytaemnestra's shout of triumph, the *Choephoroe* begins with the prayer of Orestes at night, the Queen's cry of terror, and the kindling of lights in the Palace.⁵ In the *Agamemnon* the immediate sequel is a sacrifice of incense and libations, ordered by the Queen, throughout the city. In the *Choephoroe*, libations, sent by Clytaemnestra to appease her husband, are used to rouse his spirit for revenge. In the *Eumenides* the morning prayer of the Priestess is followed by her cry of panic from the Temple; Apollo promises the end of troubles,⁶ and Clytaemnestra's spirit wakes the Furies.⁷

¹ *Ag.* I, 20.

² *Ag.* 27, 37.

³ *Od.* III, 450, IV, 772, XXII, 407.

⁴ *Ag.* 1393.

⁵ *Cho.* 32 ff., 533 ff.

⁶ *Eum.* 83, ὁστ' ἐσ τὸ πᾶν σὲ τῶνδ' ἀταλλάξαι πόνων, the Watchman's formula.

⁷ To appreciate the technique, cf. *Eum.* 106, 116, 155 ff.; and *Cho.* 31 ff., 49 ff., 376.

These echoes are deliberate. Cassandra's cry to Apollo is repeated by the Trojan women in their cry for vengeance, ὀτοτοτοτοτοτοῖ, as they summon Agamemnon's spirit.⁸ 'When the cry, ὀτοτοῖ, goes up for the dead man, the wrong-doer is discovered. The lament is like a hunter tracking his prey.'⁹ But the dirge shall be turned into a Paean,¹⁰ and the Oolugmos shall be raised over the bodies of the murderers.¹¹ It is not accident that gives ποποῖ δᾶ its own place in this terrific invocation,¹² and it is high dramatic art that makes Aegisthus cry ἐ ἐ, ὀτοτοῖ, when the blow falls.¹³ The triple οἴμοι of the servant recalls the death-cry of Agamemnon, and the ιοὺ ιού, which summons Clytaemnestra to her death, is the shout with which the Watchman woke her to cry Halleluia.¹⁴ Thrice, in the scene which follows, Clytaemnestra's poignant οῖ γά is a warning to the critic not lightly to transfer her natural speech of sorrow for her son's death to Electra.¹⁵ In the end she dies without a cry. Only the Trojan women break the silence. ἐπολούξατ' ὁ | δεσποσύνων δόμων | ἀναφυγαῖς κακῶν. . . .¹⁶ It is the Watchman's formula again.

But this triumph, like the others, ends in weeping. It is for Athens, in the final reconciliation, to combine the lights and the libations and the Oolugmos in a hymn of praise to Athene, who has brought the end of troubles.¹⁷

II.

THE WATCHMAN'S SPEECH.

This much must be said of the Trilogy as a whole, since in the study of this Prelude we are dealing not merely with the introduction of the heroine, but also with the first movement of a poem, not a patchwork. But the main purpose of the present essay is to suggest that an analysis of the first scenes of the *Agamemnon* may throw fresh light not only on the architecture of the *Oresteia*,

⁸ *Cho.* 158.

⁹ *Cho.* 325.

¹⁰ *Cho.* 341.

¹¹ *Cho.* 385.

¹² *Cho.* 406.

¹³ *Cho.* 867.

¹⁴ *Cho.* 874 ff.; *Ag.* 25, 1342.

¹⁵ *Cho.* 687, 886, 892, 927.

¹⁶ *Cho.* 941.

¹⁷ *Eum.* 1041.

but on the dramatist's conception of the character of Clytaemnestra.

As a piece of rhetoric, the first part of the Watchman's speech consists of one long paragraph (1-21), beginning with the assertion that 'throughout a whole year's watch' (*μέν*) this man has been praying for deliverance from trouble, and ending with the repeated prayer (*νῦν δέ*) that now, at last, deliverance may come, with the shining of the beacon-light.¹ The tension with which we await the beacon, and the mingled relief and apprehension with which we greet it, are partly due to the fact that the paragraph is thus composed. For the whole speech pivots, as it were, on the astonishing clause at its centre which describes the heroine. At the beginning is the prayer for release from trouble; at the end the same prayer, more urgent, and now coupled with the prayer for light: at the centre is 'the woman, masterful, with her man's will and her woman's sanguine heart.' It is not for the sake of the archaic symmetry, but for the tragic heroine's first impression on the audience, that the speech is made thus formal and exact. A literal prose version of Headlam's text may make the point clearer:

I have been praying to the Gods for Deliverance from this Trouble through the length of a whole year's watch:²

Couched, every night of it, aloft, on the roof of the Atreidae's palace, like a dog, I have made acquaintance with the assembly

¹ The technique is Homeric. Thus the *Iliad* begins, 'Sing, Goddess, of the wrath of Achilles, son of Peleus,' and of all the griefs it caused, 'in the accomplishment of the will of Zeus,' beginning 'when first the son of Atreus quarrelled with the glorious Achilles.'

² V. 1. Wilamowitz (following Hermann and others) prints a comma at *πῶνων*. But the sense is, 'I have been praying for a whole year.' *μέν* co-ordinates the sentence, not the first word only, to v. 8 and v. 20. For the order of the words and the use of *καὶ νῦν* cf. *Ag.* 592-603 *ἀναλλούσα μὲν πάλαι . . . καὶ νῦν τὰ μάσσων . . .* See also *Ag.* 40-67 (normal order, but a similar period), and *Ag.* 801-845, where the *μέν* clause is reinforced at 812 and 820, and answered, first partially at 821 *τὰ δέ ἐτοι φρόνημα*, and again at 835 *τὰ δέ ἀλλα*, then wholly at 842 *νῦν δέ ἐτοι μέλαθρα . . .* Clytaemnestra's speech repeats this effect, 878 *ἔμοιγε μέν δή . . .*, 886 *νῦν δέ μοι, φίλον κάρα*, and finally, with terrible irony, *τὰ δέ ἀλλα φροντίς οὐχ ὑπερικομένη | θῆσει δικαίως . . . 903 f.* The same trick of order occurs with *μέν—καὶ—νῦν δέ* at 1330 ff.

of the Stars of night, and with those particular bright potentates that bring men summer and storm-season, the constellations that shine pre-eminent in the firmament, their rising and their time of waning:

And I am still watching for the flame-signal, a flash of Fire, bringing a message from Troy—report of capture—

Because the sanguine spirit of a woman with a man's will is so masterful: And when I couch here through the restless night, in the dews, on a bed that no dreams visit—no dreams visit mine—

Because Fear, not Sleep, stands by me, keeping me from closing fast my eyes— Well, when I think to sing or hum a tune, cutting that herb of comfort as it were for my lack of sleep;³

Then I find myself in tears for what is happening to this household—not managed well as it once used to be:

Yet I pray that now the Fire may shine on the night with its good news, bringing good luck and the Deliverance from Trouble.

This monologue, in fact, is like a piece of goldsmith's work, not less carefully designed than, for example, are the strophe and antistrophe of a choral ode:

Prayer, and a year's watch, stars that bring storm and summer:

Still watching; for the light of victory;

Because this woman . . .

Watch at night—sleepless; dreamless; kept awake by fear;

Song on watch, as medicine . . . which turns to weeping:

Because the house is not well managed . . .

Still, I pray for light and deliverance.

[*The Beacon shines.*]

Every theme will be repeated in the sequel. The several themes will be modified, heightened, and combined with other themes, in the dramatic symphony to which this is the prelude. Again and again, with more and more intense emotion, we shall hear the prayer for deliverance from trouble, and shall hail the light that seems to bring

³ V. 12. Wilamowitz denies that *εἴτε δέ* can be caught up by *ὅταν δέ* (after the digression *φόβος γάρ . . .*), and speaks of the *philologische Unsitten* of Headlam for defending this construction by quotations from late authors. But see *Ag.* 193 ff. *καὶ τόθεν ἡγεμών ὁ πρέσβυτος . . . εἴτε ἀπόλοι . . . βαρύνοντο (πνοα δέ . . . κατέκαινον) . . . ἐπειδή δέ καὶ . . . ἀλλο μῆχαρ μάντις ἐκλαγέν . . . ἀνατέθεντο δέ ὁ πρέσβυτος τόθεν* (*τόθεν*, corr. Stanley) *εἴτε.* Here is 'resumptive δέ' twice illustrated, once with the main verb, once with the temporal *ἐπειδή* following *εἴτε*, and in a composition which recalls the structures of the prologue (beginning *δέκατον μέν έτος*, etc., and ending *τὰ δέ ἐνθεν*, etc.).

deliverance, but brings only fresh calamity. Many songs will turn to lamentation. Many cures will be tried in vain. Many restless sleepers will wake from dreams to terrors which are worse than any dreaming. And through all, this woman, with a man's strong purpose and a woman's sanguine spirit, will be dominant . . . until at last the Furies, who are Clytaemnestra's representatives, shall be converted into spirits of good will and of good hope by the goddess whose Persuasion is the instrument of reason, not of vengeance.

III.

THE BEACON AND THE QUEEN'S
HALLELUIA.

We need not labour the contention that we have here an arrangement remarkably formal in structure, spontaneous in effect, and highly dramatic. Is it deliberate or accidental? Anyhow, it is repeated.

'Hail Beacon, showing a dayspring in the night, a sign for many dances. . . . Ho! Agamemnon's wife I call to rise up from her bed and lift a pious Alleluia. Troy is taken, as the Beacon tells us. And I myself will dance: my master's luck is good and I shall benefit: a hand of trumps for me, this Beacon.'

That is the pattern of the second paragraph: the Beacon, dances, Agamemnon's wife, the Beacon, dances, my Master's luck, the Beacon.

He dances a few steps, then stops. Something depresses him.

'Well anyhow, I hope the Master will come home, and I shall clasp his hand again. For the rest—I am silent—a great ox on my tongue. The House itself, if it could find a voice, would tell a plain tale. . . .'

Then Clytaemnestra's Halleluia from the Palace, The House has found a voice. What does this Olologmos, this ambiguous cry of triumph, mean?

The pattern is continued. The chorus enters, chanting.

A year of watching and of prayer—and Clytaemnestra, expectant, planning: then the watch and prayer continued, and the answering Beacon.

The joyful Beacon, and the wife of Agamemnon, summoned to her ritual

of triumph and thanksgiving, and again the Beacon.

'The rest is silence.' If the House could speak. . . . And then the cry. Then this:

It is the tenth year now since the sons of Atreus, Agamemnon, and King Menelaus, Zeus-honoured princes, started on their expedition—with a dread war-cry, like the cry of eagles, robbed of their young, robbed of the labour that kept them to the nest. . . . And some God, Pan or Zeus, or perhaps Apollo, hears the cry, and sends a Fury to avenge them. . . . So the sons of Atreus went for vengeance upon Paris, sent by a greater Zeus, the Zeus of Hospitality. The sinner pays in the end. No burnt-sacrifice, no libation of a fireless offering,¹ can appease the stubborn wrath of Zeus.

We know, as the Elders do not know, that Clytaemnestra means to kill her husband. And we know that her motive—if the poet chooses—will be vengeance for a murdered child. The Princes clamoured for the loss of Helen with a cry like the cry of eagles 'robbed of their young.' We have heard the cry of Clytaemnestra. When she enters (on the word 'Ερινύ), and begins to pour her oils and light her sacrifice, we know that she is praying for the death of Agamemnon. And we know her motive. Her Olologmos was a mother's

¹ *V. 69.* I accept Casaubon's ὑποκαλιών, and regard οὐτε δακρύων as probably a gloss on οὐδε' ὑποκαλιών (though Wilamowitz reads οὐτε δὲ ἀγρύων: 'θυμάματα accedunt ad ξυπνυρα et σπονδάς'). In view of *Eum.* 106-9 (ἢ πολλά μὲν δῆ τῶν ἐμῶν ἀλειχαρεῖ | χοάς τ' δοίους, νηφάλια μειληγματα, | καὶ νυκτούσεμα δέπιν' ἐπ' ἀρχάροι πυρός | θύνον κ.τ.λ.). I think that the right reading here is ὑπολειών ἀπόρων λεπών (ὑπο—conveying a suggestion of the vain attempt to escape consequences). The genitive denotes the substance of the offering (see Headlam on *Ag.* 1394). The sense is 'neither by burnt sacrifice, nor by libation of fireless offerings.' Fireless offerings were normally offered to the chthonic powers, but sometimes in propitiation to the Olympians. Here the phrase glances at the sacrifice of Iphigeneia. Headlam's (posthumous) note appears to be made up of two inconsistent collections of material. In *Ag.* 1394, 'if it were possible to pour a libation of the appropriate material over this body,' Headlam is right in insisting that libation over the dead is in fact the normal practice. He is wrong, however, in his interpretation of τάδε in *v. 1395*. It means 'blood,' and catches up the thought of 1388 f.

The dramatic sequel of all this is the fatal offering to the dead in the *Choephoroe*, sent by Clytaemnestra because she hoped it would be ἀκος τομαῖον πήματος (*Cho.* 518-19, 537).

cry for vengeance. The sequel of her prayer and sacrificial rite is this:

Ζεῦ, Ζεῦ, τέλειε, τὰς ἔμας εὐχάς τέλει . . .

For the present, she performs her rite in silence. In an interlude of gentle pathos, which relieves our sense of tragic urgency—or, rather, gives it time to sink into our consciousness, making us fitter subjects for the poet's purpose, the old men sing: 'We are old, we could not go to war. We are old and weak, like children. Our leaf is fading. We walk with faltering steps, like dreams abroad by day.'

Then this third paragraph, which draws its tragic meaning from the first: 'Queen Clytaemnestra, why this sacrifice and these libations? These flames that leap to heaven from the altars, these fires of sacrifice, medicined by the soft innocent Persuasion of your own royal unguent? I pray that this may mean good news, the shining of a light of hope—and yet—I am always anxious!'

IV.

THE CHORAL ODE AND THE QUEEN'S FIRST WORDS.

The choral ode begins with a reference to the theme of the central paragraph of the anapaests: 'We are old, like dreams.' The Queen has not given an answer to the question of the Elders. She has proceeded on her way to other altars in the city. And the old men sing:

We are still competent to sing: we may be old, but still heaven lets our old age inspire us with the Impulse—Peitho—the desire to sing, which is strength for singing.

The theme they choose for their comfort is the sign of victory which the Achaean leaders saw near the Palace when they started, the omen of two eagles devouring a pregnant hare.

Sing woe for Linos! (Woe for youth dead, that is.) But may the good prevail.

The poem falls, like the anapaests, and like the paragraphs of the Watchman's speech, into three well-defined divisions:

First, the sign of victory, the omen of the eagles and the pregnant hare, with its interpretation by the prophet.

Then the central panel, Zeus the only com-

fort, the establisher of the stern law, wisdom must come by suffering . . . by chastening in the night season.

Then the fulfilment of the omen, the fatal sacrifice of Iphigeneia.

The central panel, Zeus and the sinner, chastened in sleep, is again an interlude, marking a pause between two chapters of the old men's story. And each chapter is a poem, shaped by the artist in the mould with which we are now growing familiar, a period beginning *κύριος εἴμι θροεῖς δόσον τέρας*, and finding its conclusion in the musical recurrence of the phrase (*μόρσιμ' ἀπ' ὄρνιθων ὁδίων κ.τ.λ.*). The attitude of Aeschylus to the sacrifice of Iphigeneia has, I think, been needlessly debated. For the audience, the omen has a very clear and simple meaning. The eagles are, as Calchas says, the sons of Atreus. But the young hare in the womb, on which they feast—*θυομένοιστι*, like sacrificers—is the child of Clytaemnestra. That impious sacrifice, not merely Troy's destruction, invokes heaven's vengeance. The omen was a warning. Calchas read it skilfully enough, but he read it ill. And Agamemnon, who 'criticised no prophet,' was wicked when he yielded to the clamour for a human victim.

Calchas perceived that the eagles were the sons of Atreus, and he said, interpreting the portent: 'In time Troy is your prey—not without sacrifices, which shall consume the substance of the Trojans: only I fear some stroke may fall on our own army because Artemis is angry with the eagles, the sacrificers of the timorous creature's unborn brood. . . . Sing woe for Linos, yet may the good prevail.'

He does not really understand. He knows the eagles as the sons of Atreus. That is obvious. But this pregnant hare? What is it? Troy, perhaps? Yes, and the brood? Perhaps the Trojan cattle to be sacrificed by Priam and by Hector—it is a recurrent theme of the *Iliad*. And yet the thing is disquieting. This hunting of a pregnant hare is not sportsmanlike.¹ What if Artemis be angry? What if she need placation . . . a sacrifice in kind . . . a child?

That is his process of divination. Is he right? For Aeschylus, of course not. But presently, when the fleet is held up at Aulis, Calchas will be certain.

¹ See Lucas, *Class. Rev.* XXXV., p. 28.

He will openly demand the victim, and the army will support him, and the King will yield. For the present Calchas prays :

Though so tender, lovely goddess, to the suckling young of all wild creatures, including the young whelps of the fierce lions . . . grant the fulfilment of this omen—because it means victory at any rate—with its mixture of good and ill.

His reference to the whelps of lions is meant to placate Artemis, to remind her that the sons of Atreus are throned between the Lions of Mycenae. But the effect is one of tragic irony. She is, indeed, on the side of the young lions—not of the old. Calchas proceeds :

And I call to Paean, the Healer, the god of the cry Iē, prevent her from sending us contrary winds that will hold back the fleet and delay us, in her zeal for another sacrifice, lawless, without a feast, a maker of quarrels in the family, with no fear of a husband, leaving behind to lurk in the house Wrath, always remembering, crafty—of child-vengeance.

Then the period is rounded off, as we have said, by a recurrence of the opening phrase. Then the central panel :

Zeus, whosoe'er he be, if by this name it please him to be called, this name I give him : I have none to liken to him, though I weigh all things in the balance, save Zeus alone, if I am to throw off this weight of care.

There was one who ruled of old : he waxed fat, he was strong and overweening : he shall not even be spoken of as having been. And he who followed is gone too : he met a wrestler who outwrestled him, and he is gone. To Zeus alone sing victorious Alleluia, and ye shall not fail of wisdom.

The threefold pattern again, and now the epilogue :

Zeus, who hath set men's feet in the path of wisdom : who hath decreed, it shall be law, by suffering alone comes knowledge : when in the time of sleep the pain that brings the memory of the old wrong trickles at the heart, then to unwilling learners comes modesty of mind : it is a mercy forced on men by spirits seated on the holy bench.

That is a new development of the old motif of the restless night and the dreams.

Now the third panel, answering the first—not metrically, but in content . . .

So then the captain of the ships—he would not ever criticise a prophet—he was one who yielded to the wind of fortune when it blew against him . . . when the fleet could not sail and the people were distressed at Aulis, and the winds came down from Thrace, with hunger, wearisome . . . and when the prophet cried aloud for a strange medicine, more cruel than

the tempest for the chieftains, alleging Artemis, so that the sons of Atreus beat their staves upon the ground and wept, then the King spoke . . .

Hard to disobey, and hard to sacrifice my daughter . . . well, may all end in good. . . . And once he had shouldered this yoke of 'needs must' his heart veered round, set full for sin. So distraction drives men to their ruin.

Let us not lose sight of the structure. First the omen and the grim interpretation. Then the central prayer to Zeus. Then the application to the son of Atreus, and this picture of the sacrifice—it is a new and wonderful development of the old themes, anxiety and dayspring after darkness, singing that turns to sorrow, sacrifices and libations :

Her veil of saffron dye falling to the ground about her, with a glance of her piteous eye she smote each of her sacrificers, showing as in a picture, ready to speak to them, as often in her father's hospitable hall she had sung : and the clear voice of that unsotted virgin lovingly had graced the Paean of good fortune at the third libation for the father of her love. What came afterwards I did not see, and do not tell. The arts of Calchas were not without fulfilment. Justice in the turning of her scale brings to the sufferer knowledge. The future you will hear when it has come. Till then farewell to it. . . . It will come clear enough with the early rays of morning. . . . May the issue end in good, as is the wish of this . . . the guardian, sole regent, closest in her kinship. . . .

I am come, Clytaemnestra, in deference to your command and rule.

Can we doubt that the 'sole guardian' is Clytaemnestra, not the chorus? This woman, masked and beautiful, is a mother, robbed of her child by Agamemnon . . . the eagle, who devoured the hare, quick in the womb.

That is why the first chorus treats of Iphigeneia. Clytaemnestra is a mother.

We feel it, not in spite of, but because of the archaic symmetry of the composition, which has made the poet, for example, begin his Watchman's speech with 'A year of watching and of praying for the end of troubles,' and conclude it with 'The rest is silence . . . if the House could speak,' and then begin his choral anapaests with 'Ten years of war . . .' and end his ode with this: 'The rest I did not see, nor do I tell . . . I pray the sequel may be good, as is the wish of this—the Nearest . . .' Clytaemnestra speaks.

She speaks, and, thanks to the Prelude, every phrase is instinct with her tragedy.

With good news, as the proverb says, may Morning come to birth from her Mother Night. You shall hear a joy, greater than any hope. The Greeks have taken Troy.

I cannot understand—it is so incredible.... Troy in Achaean hands. Is that clear enough?

Joy steals over me. I weep.... Yes, your eye betrays your loyalty. What makes you sure? Have you any proof of it?

Of course, if the god has not cheated me.

That is death to Agamemnon.

Is it some dream that you believe? I am not one to talk about the fancies of a sleepy mind.

Is it some rumour perhaps that has gladdened you?

You think I am as foolish as—a young girl. How long ago is it that Troy was captured? I tell you, in the Night that was the Mother of this Day.

That, for the moment, is the culmination of these periods, each ending with the repetition, in a new and heightened form, of its first phrase. Their purpose, as we said at the outset, is not simply rhetorical, but dramatic. Clytaemnestra is a mother, robbed of her child. It is because she is a mother that she greets this day of triumph as a child new-born from the womb of a tragic night.

V.

THE PATTERN OF THE SEQUEL.

The Beacon speech, which Wilamowitz thinks quite undramatic, is instinct with Clytaemnestra's hatred for her husband. 'Hephaistos sent from Ida a bright flame,' and when the fire has swept across the Aegean, and has swooped at last upon 'the Spider's Crag near home'—Clytaemnestra is the spider (1493)—we understand, because the paragraph is duly ended by the repetition, the tragic meaning of the phrase 'So it alights upon the Atreidae's roof, this light whose ancestor was the fire on Ida.' The flame that was lit at Troy shall be lit again in Argos. That is her thought.

Again, the Herald's storm-speech balances in the design the beacon-speech of Clytaemnestra, just as his speech about the hardships of campaigning and the long sleep of the dead responds—in a rhetorical chiasmus—to Clytaemnestra's speech

about the captured city and the dangerous wrath of the fallen. First the fiery beacons—baneful fires, lit in Ilion, now coming home to Argos—then the description of the careless conquerors, and of their danger from the wrathful dead. Then the Herald's story, and his talk of the sleeping dead, whom he tries in vain to forget while he praises Agamemnon's greatness. Then this: 'Even we survivors did not all escape. Menelaus was cut off by a conspiracy of fire and sea, two ancient enemies, now reconciled.'

That is the pattern. Is it not dramatic? Athene and Poseidon joined, as everyone knows, in this conspiracy. But more than that is implied for our imagination. The plot against King Agamemnon is a plot of fire and water, Clytaemnestra and Aegisthus. With the sacrifices and libations, the incense and the unguents, the fire that heats the cauldron, the waters of the marriage bath, the oil of the anointing of the radiant victim, play their part in the symbolism of this poem. When Agamemnon steps upon the purple, we shall hear the cry of Clytaemnestra: 'There is the sea, and who shall dry it? Breeding much purple, precious as silver, still oozing and still fresh....' The sea of purple is a sea of blood, breeding fresh blood.

That, in the tragedy, is the chief function of the Herald's speech about the sea. But it has another function, also relevant to our discussion. By making Menelaus the last theme of this poor Herald's gloomy news-bringing, Aeschylus makes it natural that his chorus should revert to thoughts of Helen.

Look back to the whole design, and you will find that Aeschylus does not treat his choral odes as independent poems, but as vital and connected parts of one dramatic composition.

In their first anapaests, the Elders, in an interlude between their talk about the vengeance of the Zeus of Hospitality on Paris and their appeal to Clytaemnestra, spoke of themselves as old men, weak as children, dreams abroad by day. Then, in a greater interlude, between their song about the omen and their story of its grim fulfilment, they cried to Zeus,

the First
it in
ros—
reless
from
ald's
dead,
while
ness.
s did
t off
two
not
idon
this
at is
plot
ot of
and
and
ents,
the
oil of
ctim,
on of
steps
the cry
sea,
uch
zing
purple
od.
chief
about
ion.
By
this
ing,
his
s of
and
not
lent
arts
ers,
about
lity
em-
men,
day.
een
tory
zeus,

who chastens men in the night seasons, sending wisdom through the dreams of stricken conscience. The second choral ode—a song of triumph that turned to lamentation—began by taking up again this central theme of the first poem: 'Praise Zeus, who punishes the sinner, Paris,' and it ended—'alas, we fear for the sons of Atreus also.'

But its central panel was a picture of the deserted Menelaus, dreaming of Helen.

The third chorus in its turn takes up this central theme and makes it the main theme of a fresh song.

Helen, so beautiful, and in the end so terrible, a bride turned to a Fury.

Then, for a central panel, the apologue of the lion's whelp.

Then Helen again, the fatal bride, so charming, and so deadly.

Then, as an epilogue, the moral: Sin breeds sin, and a *daemon* is at last begotten.

Clytaemnestra is the second Helen, the second fatal Bride and Fury, Peitho incarnate. The Prelude is completed. It is time for Agamemnon to arrive—anapaests greet him as they greeted Clytaemnestra on her first appearance.

J. T. SHEPPARD.

THE DITHYRAMB—AN ANATOLIAN DIRGE.

THE earliest references to the Dithyrambos in Greek literature preserve a hint of the direction from which this obviously foreign word reached the shores of Greece. Herodotus says explicitly that the name *διθύραμβος* was brought to Corinth by Arion of Lesbos;¹ and Naxos and Paros, which lay on the rea-route from south-western Asia Minor to the Saronic Gulf, are brought into the story by Pindar and Archilochus respectively.² The dithyramb was regularly set to Phrygian music, and sung to the flute; Aristotle records the failure of an attempt to set it to Dorian music.³ It has often been surmised that the dithyramb and its name were Asiatic. Haigh made the suggestion, without adducing any evidence in support, that both *διθύραμβος* and *θρίαμβος* were of Phrygian origin.⁴ The efforts to explain *διθύραμβος* as a Greek word—beginning with Euripides' and Plato's derivation from the 'double birth' of Dionysus⁵ and culminating in

Mr. A. B. Cook's *Δι-θορ-αμβος* ('Zeus-leap-song'⁶)—have all failed to satisfy either grammar or common sense.

Aristotle's statement that tragedy originated *ἀπὸ τῶν ἐξαρχόντων τὸν διθύραμβον* makes the question of the origin and earliest form of the dithyramb itself one of the most important problems in literary history. The interest of the problem is reflected in recent controversy: *Θριαμβο-Διθύραμβο* has become the slogan in a literary *γυγαντομαχία*, waged by champions who command every resource of European, Asiatic, and African anthropology. If I presume to enter this formidable arena in the light equipment of a pair of Phrygian gravestones, it is only because I agree with Haigh that the obvious place in which to look for the origin of the dithyramb is the Phrygian hinterland of Ionia and Aeolis. If the following derivation of the word *διθύραμβος* suggests an origin in Anatolian grave-ritual, the fault lies with no preconceived theory, but with the evidence. The evidence is comparatively new; it would no doubt have been used earlier, had it been available.

In 1898, J. G. C. Anderson published a Phrygian inscription⁷ from Tyriaion

dithyramb had for its subject the birth of Dionysos. Plato is merely alluding—and sceptically at that—to the current etymology.

¹ Quoted approvingly by Miss Jane Harrison in *Themis*, p. 204. See Ridgeway, *Dramas and Dramatic Dances*, p. 44.

² *J.H.S.*, 1898, p. 121. See also *J.H.S.*, 1911, p. 214, on the text of this inscription.

¹ I. 23: 'Ἄριστα τὸν Μηθυμναῖον . . . διθύραμβον πρώτον ἀνθρώπων τῶν ἡμεῖς ὅμεν ποιήσαντά τε καὶ οὐνομάσαντα καὶ διδάξαντα ἐν Κορίνθῳ.'

² Pindar (see Schol. in *Oly.* XIII. 10) derived the dithyramb from Naxos and from Thebes as well as from Corinth (see last note). Archilochus of Paros is the earliest writer who uses the word *διθύραμβος*. Later, Simonides of Ceos composed a dithyramb on the hero Memnon.

³ *Politics*, VIII. 7.

⁴ *Tragic Drama*, p. 16.

⁵ Eur. *Bacchae*, 526 ff.; Plato, *Legg.* 700B: καὶ ἄλλο (ψῆφος εἶδος), Διονύσου γένεσις οἵμαι, διθύραμβος λεγόμενος. Note the sceptical οἵμαι. This passage is usually read as meaning that the

(known to classical scholars as the scene of a famous review described in Xenophon's *Anabasis*), which contained the first known example of a noun, *διθρέπα*, meaning 'tomb' or 'sepulchral monument.' In 1911 the writer published a Phrygian inscription¹ of Iconium, containing the word *διθρέψα*, either a noun or an adjective, with similar meaning. The Tyriaion inscription runs as follows; it is in rough elegiac verse:

ασ σεμουν κνουμανα διθρέψα κ(ε) Ξενεοι 'δδικει ειαν
μακαν τα εσταε βρατερε μαμαργαν
Πουκρος Μανισ[ιο]ν ενεταρκει δι τουν]βον?] Ξενεια . . .

The Iconian inscription, which is strongly graecised, is in the following terms:

Ηλιος Γαιος αγοραν αχανει τοτον Καοανια πραγ-
ματικον ατ ω κα
εισταη πελτα κα ηδια διθρέψα σα πριεις [Α]ι[ρ]ηλιαν
Βασ[αν]. δοτις
επ[ιβιδ[σηστε (sic), διδ[σει] τψ φίσκ[ψ] (δηηράπια) α.

Both these inscriptions belong to the small group of late Phrygian inscriptions in which the construction of the tomb is described in Phrygian. The great majority of these texts consist of a *devotio* in Phrygian, usually appended to a Greek inscription describing the preparation of the tomb. The meaning of the words *κνουμανα* and *πελτα* is certain. The commonest word for 'tomb' in the Phrygian inscriptions is *κνουμανει* (dat.), and the writer has shown² that *πελτα* means the sub-structure on which the monument, usually an altar or doorstone, sometimes a sarcophagus, stood. In Phrygian we find *κε* both interposed like Greek *και* and enclitic like Latin *-que*, and in the above two inscriptions *κνουμανα* and *πελτα* respectively have a word, or a group of words, tacked on to them by *κε*.³ The word *διθρέπα*

¹ *J.H.S.*, 1911, p. 188.

² *Revue de Philologie*, 1912, p. 51. The clinching text is . . . κατεσκειασε τα πελτα αιν
τψ επενταρι Βαριδ . . . (Iconium).

³ I take *κα* to be a dialectic variety of *κε*. The interpretation of the later Phrygian inscriptions owes most to Ramsay's paper on *Jahresh. Oest. Arch. Inst.*, 1905, col. 79 ff., where much new material is added to the same writer's collection in *Kuhns Zeitsch. XXVIII*, pp. 381 ff. Further fresh material was utilised in *J.H.S.*, 1911, pp. 161 ff., and 1913, pp. 97 ff. See also Fraser, *Phrygian Studies* in *Trans. Camb. Phil. Soc.*, 1913, and Richard Meister

must be a noun, and *διθρέψα* must be either a noun or an adjective according as *ηδια* is taken as adjective or as noun. In either case there is no doubt as to the meaning 'monument' or some sepulchral attribute or characteristic.

While the meaning is clear, the form of the two words presents great difficulty. The contexts in which they occur, and their evident similarity or identity of meaning, suggest at first sight that we have in the two words a common stem with varying suffix. The -r- suffix assumed on this view in *διθρέπα* is well attested in Anatolian personal and place-names over a wide area, but I can find no parallel to the suffix postulated for *διθρέψα*. One might well suspect an engraver's error in *διθρέψα*, which may have been cut in mistake for *διθρέπα* by a Greek sculptor ignorant of Phrygian. It should be noted that in both inscriptions the reading is clear and certain.

And the difficulty concerns not only the termination in *διθρέψα*, but the stem in both words. Phrygian drops the aspirates, and it looks at first sight as if the two words were loan-words in Phrygian. In my commentary in *J.H.S.*, 1911, p. 142, I made an attempt to save them for Phrygian by supposing that Θ was due to the influence of late Greek orthography, which confused Θ and T (e.g. θέκνοις for τέκνοις). Working on the same lines, J. Fraser (*Phrygian Studies*, p. 9) suggested that *διθρέπα* is *dui-trē-ro* 'with two cavities' and *διθρέψα* *dui-trēb-so* 'with two dwelling-places.' Neither procedure is satisfactory. The orthographical substitution of Θ for T does not occur elsewhere in the Phrygian inscriptions,⁴ and it would be surprising, to say the least, to find it confined to these two suspiciously similar words. It is equally unconvincing to postulate different stems for two isolated and apparently cognate words, occurring in contexts which compel us to assume identity of meaning, occurring, too, within a narrow geographical area.

in *Xenia Nicolaihana* (ca. 1912). For a full discussion of the two inscriptions quoted above see *J.H.S.*, 1911, pp. 178, 188, 214.

⁴ Except, perhaps, in No. LXV.; but this is very doubtful.

An obvious way out of the difficulty is to assume that the two words are borrowed. The Phrygians were immigrants in Asia Minor, and it is a natural assumption that they borrowed many words belonging to the old Anatolian language, especially the language of religion. In the other cases in which Θ is used in the Phrygian inscriptions, borrowing seems probable. The word θαλαμει (dat.) in one of the inscriptions¹ is probably derived, as Ramsay suggests to me, from the old Anatolian language.² The only other Phrygian inscription in which certainly Θ occurs (*ibid.*, No. XLVIII, Ε...ΙΘΝΙΟΤ-Μ Ε ΝΟC, Ενσταρναδονυθ, οιονθβαν) has not been satisfactorily explained. The identifiable deities in that inscription are old Anatolian or Persian (Ma, Ba, Μιτραφατα³), and it may be that here too Θ indicates borrowing. The hypothesis that διθρεπα is borrowed from a Greek form διθυρον may at once be cleared out of the way; διθυρον does not occur among the multitudinous Greek words meaning 'grave' in Asia Minor, and what does not exist cannot be borrowed. It is a possible view that διθρεπα and (if the form is correct) διθρεψα contain an old Anatolian root, meaning 'grave,' which lingered on and retained the aspirated form in the Phrygian language.

But a different explanation, which occurred to me as archaeologically preferable if philologically sound, commends itself also to Ramsay, whose support emboldens me to put it forward as highly probable. In his commentary on the Tyriaion inscription,⁴ Ramsay wrote: 'Θ seems to be non-Phrygian; yet it is quite certain, and the aspiration is in place before P. Professor Sayce very ingeniously suggests that in this word and ΑΡΕΓΡΟΤΝ (xxxiii), a para-

sitic P is developed after a dental, similar to Cretan τρε for σε. He compares also the glosses in Hesychius δεδροικώς· (δε)δοικώς: δρύεται· κρύπτεται: ἄτρεγκτος· ἄβροχος: πιφραύσκων· πιφαύσκων: φρυγά· φνυή: βρῆσσαι· βῆσσαι; . . . If he is right, we might perhaps take θρεπα as representing *dhwara*, θύρα, Latin *fores*: then διθρεπα would be a tomb with double doors (a common type of store; an example is shown *Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia*, p. 628). In reply to an enquiry, Ramsay (while deprecating the application of strict phonetic rules to the relation between Greek mouths and ears and the Greek alphabet on the one hand, and Anatolian pronunciation on the other) suggests an alternative explanation of the form διθρεπα. 'The old Anatolian languages, as we see in Lycian and Lydian and in numberless proper names, delighted in the use of the spirant and of nasalised vowels, and enunciated R and L in very different fashion from the Greek. I see no difficulty in believing that an old I.D.E. *didwar* was represented in Greek spelling as *dithrer* by a Greek-speaking Phrygian: *cf. J.H.S.*, 1920, p. 199. One historical example may suffice: the Pisidian bishopric, whose name appears in Greek spelling as *Sinethandos* (for *Sinethiandos*) and *Sinnada* and *Sintriandos* and *Sitriandos* and *Siniandros* and *Siniandos* (possibly also *Sunnad* in *Ibn Kordadbeh*) must, I think, have borne the name *Siūrad* among the Orondian mountaineers. R in these variations is soft vocalic, like English RE in pretty.'

If this explanation of the form is accepted,⁵ it gives us a derivation which exactly fits the local religious conditions. The religion of Phrygia, as Ramsay and others have shown by overwhelming evidence, centred in the cult of the grave. The family tomb (*προγονικόν* or *συγγενικόν*) was the *οίκος* in which the dead lived, and a cardinal feature in sepulchral architecture was the door, occasionally called θύρα on the monument, which provided communication

¹ *J.H.S.*, 1911, p. 166, No. IV.

² That θάλαμος or θάλαμη is an old Anatolian word, borrowed thence by both Greek and Phrygian, appears from the following passages:

(1) Hesychius, θαλάμαι· στήλαι ἐπικειμέναι τοῖς αἰδοῖσις τῶν ἀποκόπων (which were evidently buried in a grave under a monument with a *stèle*—the whole custom is Anatolian, and Phrygian by adoption). (2) Hesychius, κύβελα· δρη Φρυγιας. καὶ ἀντρα. καὶ θάλαμοι.

³ Note Μιτρα, not Μιθρα.

⁴ *Jahresh. Oest. Arch. Inst.*, 1905, col. 89.

⁵ We should in this case have to regard διθρεψα as a mistake for διθρεπα; but even on the assumption that the root is 'dithre-' διθρεψα is a difficult form.

between the living and the dead.¹ The monument is often represented symbolically as a door; the 'doorstones,' with the altars, are the commonest type of grave-monument in Phrygia. Occasionally the door is shown as consisting of two valves (a two-valved door is reproduced in *Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia*, p. 628, referred to above), or two or more doors are represented side by side. It is an obvious suggestion that the word *διθέρεπα* was applied to a monument of this type. The 'double door' may refer either to a doorstone with two valves, or to any doorstone as symbolically leading in two directions²—outwards to the world of life, inwards to the world of death.

Whatever may be the correct explanation of the form of the word, it is very tempting to recognise in it the Anatolian original of the Greek *διθύραμβος*, which may have arisen by anaptyxis from *διθρ-αμβος*, or may—on Ramsay's view of the character of P following Θ—be an attempt to write *διθρερ-αμβος* in Greek. In such a case as this, a parallel strengthens conviction, and we can point to a similar development in the case of another old Anatolian word. Plutarch tells us that *λάβρος* is a Lydian word meaning 'axe,' and archaeology has supplied ample confirmation. From *λάβρος* we get the Anatolian derivatives *λαβρανδος*, *λαβρανδος*, *λαβρενδος*, *λαβραδενς* (ethnic),³ and the same

¹ See Miss Ramsay in *Studies in the E.R. Prov.*, p. 65, where references are quoted.

² This is Ramsay's suggestion. He compares the term *δίπυλος*, applied by Plutarch (II. 322B), to the temple of Janus.

³ Kretschmer, *Einleitung*, p. 303; cf. p. 404.

HOMERIC HYMN TO HERMES 109 f.

MESSRS. ALLEN AND SIKES may have 'blundered as usual'¹ in translating *ἐπελεύθε* as 'pruned to a point.' I am quite incompetent to judge. But I should like to point out that Mr. Agar appears to have the most hazy notions upon the process of producing fire by a fire-stick or of the physics thereof. The principle depends upon the fact that finely divided carbon takes fire easily, as was seen in the old tinder box. The process is as follows: The fire-block, *στροφεύς*, is a piece of soft and very

¹ See T. L. Agar in *Class. Rev.* XXXV., p. 97.

word appears in Greek in the form *λαβύρινθος*.

For the first element of *διθύραμβος*, the meaning of 'grave' is attested. Comparing *διθύρ-αμβος* with *θρι-αμβος* and *ιαμβος* we cannot doubt that the second element means 'song' or a ritual performance of some kind, and we get the meaning 'grave-song' or 'dirge' for the dithyramb. As regards *-αμβος*, it may be worth while to point out that Semitic *-אַבָּת* appears a *-אַמְבָ-* in Phrygia (e.g. *Sabbatha* becomes *Sambatios* as well as *Sabbatios*);⁴ and that the abbasum of the march of Cn. Manlius Vulso in Phrygia is quoted by Stephanus in the form *Ἀμβασον*.⁵ A similar variation, if Ramsay is right, occurs in the form of the place-name Lampe, Lappa, Appa.⁶ Possibly *αμβος* is connected with *Αββας*,⁷ an ancient divine name or title, which may, like *Ιανά*, etc., have come to mean a sacred hymn. Conversely, *Διθύραμβος* itself was used as a title of Dionysus. If this suggestion is correct, the *θρηνων ἔξαρχοι* of *Iliad* XXIV. 721 are no other than the *ἔξαρχοντες τὸν διθύραμβον* of the *Poetics*, although Aristotle was quite unconscious of the connection. In its passage from Asia to Greece the dithyramb, like Dionysus himself, changed its character.

W. M. CALDER.

⁴ See A. Reinach, *Noē Sangarion*, p. 73.

⁵ I assume an identification which implies a new theory of the march of Manlius, which I hope soon to publish.

⁶ *Cities and Bishoprics*, p. 347.

⁷ See Kretschmer, *op. cit.*, p. 336, and add to his references *Αββουκάμη* in an unpublished inscription of Laodicea Combusta (at Kadyn Khan).

dry wood; the borer, *τρύπανον*, is of harder wood, and is pointed. The borer is either made to revolve by means of the hands or by a primitive drill, such as a bow drill or a spindle drill. The fire-block is held with the feet. If the hands alone are used, they twirl the borer exactly as a swizzle stick is twirled, the point of the borer revolving in a small hole in the fire-block. If the wood is properly dry and the right pressure is used, the sides of the hole fritter down into fine dust, which chars and eventually becomes red hot. Fine shavings or dry grass or leaves are then held over the red-hot dust and blown upon till a flame is produced which can be further fed. Mr. Agar's idea that the fire-block might be covered with iron is

absurd. Friction of wood against iron will fire the wood, as is seen in the occasional firing of a brake-block on a railway waggon, but only at an expenditure of energy far greater than any unaided man can produce, or even one aided with a hand-drill.

Sometimes, instead of being revolved, the borer, still pointed, is rubbed to and fro in a groove in the fire-block, which makes Mr. Agar's conjecture of *ἐνιάλλε στοργῇ* possible. The process is difficult, and I have never succeeded myself either with or without a drill; making fire with a flint and steel is quite easy if the tinder be dry. With the fire-stick, unless just the right pressure be used, failure results; if too much pressure be used the fire-block merely polishes and no dust is formed; if too little, again no dust is formed nor any heat. I have often managed to get the wood hot and to smoke, but nothing like as hot as I got myself. I should add that modern man will find it easier to hold the fire block in a vice, and not with the feet.

I imagine that the difficulty of making fire before the use of the flint and steel was the origin of such regulations as those concerning the fire of Vesta, and of such a simile as that in *Od. V. 488 ff.*

As an old Etonian, I may perhaps be pardoned if I add that the facts which I have cited remind me of a famous cricket ground—namely, Agar's Plough.

H. P. CHOLMELEY.

LUA MATER: FIRE, RUST, AND WAR IN EARLY ROMAN CULT.

ONE of the obscurest and most puzzling figures in the Roman pantheon is *Lua Mater*. This paper is an attempt to clear up some of the problems connected with her and with certain other deities who seem to me to form part of the same very early circle of ideas.

Very little is definitely stated about her by the ancients.¹ She is invoked with *Saturn* (*Lua Saturni*, in the *com-precationes* in Gellius XIII. 23, 2). She is one of the deities to whom arms taken from the enemy may be burned (*Liv. XLV. 33, 1, cf. VIII. 1, 6*). Her name is probably connected with *lues*.² There are no inscriptions in her honour, and no record of any sacrifices to her, other than the burning of arms.

A plausible conjecture introduces her, it is true, into the following passage from the inter-

polator of *Servius* on *Aen. III. 139*: *ARBORI-BVSQVE SATISQVE LVES*—quidam dicunt diuersis numinibus uel bene uel male faciendi potestatem dicatam, ut . . . Iunoni procreationem liberorum, sterilitatem horum tam Saturno quam Lunae; hanc enim sicut Saturnum orbandi potestatem habere. For *Lunae*, Preller would read *Luae*, and Wissowa agrees. But (1) the gloss is very confused, for it sets out to show that the same deity can both bless and ban, as Apollo in Vergil's text, though god of leechcraft, sends a plague, and goes on to say that different deities, acting in pairs, send blessing and curse respectively. (2) The text will make sense without emendation. An astrological reference will surprise no one who knows the commentators on Vergil, and *Luna* is connected with *orbitas* (see e.g. *Firmicus Maternus, Mathesis VI. 29, 3*, to take the first passage that comes to hand). That the functions of the gods were in later times closely bound up with the supposed influences of those heavenly bodies which bore their names is well known. I prefer, therefore, to leave this passage on one side, remarking only that if Preller's emendation be accepted it merely strengthens the proof of the unpleasant nature of *Lua*, which is apparent enough from her name (as Wissowa sees, *l.c.* and *RKR²*, p. 208).

We are left, then, with a deity connected (1) with sowing, or the god of sowing; (2) with plague; (3) with burning. What functions can she have to include these three discrete spheres of activity?

I hold in the first place that we shall handicap ourselves needlessly if we think of her too closely in connection with *Saturnus*. Connected with him, indeed, she must be in some way, or no official prayer would mention them together; but looking at the list in Gellius, I think we can find some evidence that these pairings of deities are rather of the nature of differentiating titles than of expressions of permanent relationship. For what does the genitive case here mean? Certainly not kinship; *Lua* is not wife or daughter of *Saturnus*, for Italian numina have no such relationships. Some sort of subordination then is most naturally to be assumed, but is it permanent or temporary? Is *Lua* who is subordinated to *Saturn* the only indigitation of *Lua*? Not necessarily, for the list (supplemented by *Fest. epit. 100 M/71 Th.*) shows us on the one hand *Herie Iunonis*, on the other *Herie Martia*, in whom it is at least plausible to recognise two forms of the same name, related probably to the Oscan

¹ See Wissowa in *Roscher's Lexikon II. 2146*.

² v. Domaschewski (*Abhandlungen zur röm. Rel.* p. 109 and n.3) denies this, and declares that she is an 'Eigenschaftsgöttin des *Saturnus* . . . und zwar . . . jene Eigenschaft, die das Keimen der Saaten befördert,' but he gives no proof, etymological or other.

Herentas, and signifying the will or wish of Mars and of Iuno respectively (cf. Osc. *herest*, uolet). And as for Lua we find her associated with Mars in a context (Liv. *ll. cc.*) from which Saturnus is wholly excluded. We may then reasonably hold that the pairings of deities quoted by Gellius no more preclude the possibility of those same deities appearing in other partnerships than the existence of Zeus Heraios proves him permanently subject to Hera, or the indigitation of Apollo as *medicus* and *paean* (Macr. *Sat.* I. xvii. 15) forbids us to believe that he was worshipped under other titles also. Lua Saturni is simply Lua, who on this occasion is worshipped in conjunction with Saturnus.

It remains, then, to consider her name and her warlike functions, and to try to explain them in a way which will leave room for her occasional association with the spirit of sowing. In the first place, *lues* is as vague a word as 'plague' in English. It is used of blight on trees and plants in the passage of Vergil just quoted, while elsewhere it may signify a disease attacking men. Here we want a plague or destruction which might attack seeds, and at the same time is connected with war and burning. One naturally thinks of fire.

That Lua is actually a fire-goddess is not likely. It is not she, but Maia and later Stata Mater, who are named in the cult of Volcanus. The latter has apparently no connection at all with Saturnus, and in the passages which mention the burning of arms in his honour (Livy I. 37, 5; XXIII. 46, 5; XXX. 6, 9) Lua does not appear. But it is noteworthy that for a fire-god to be connected with an agricultural deity is by no means unexampled. Maia herself is the goddess of growth or increase, to judge by her name, and her month is that in which the early summer vegetation is growing. Vesta again is connected, or at least the Vestal Virgins are, with agricultural rites—the spelt harvest in May, the ritual of the Argei, the Fordicidia, the Ecuus October. But with Mars Lua seems to have a two-fold connection, viz.: (1) that the deities to whom arms may be sacrificed are, in Livy XLV. 38, 1, Mars, 'Minerua'

(i.e., Nerio)¹ and Lua, and (2) that the Arval Brothers pray (Henzen, p. cciv.), *neue luerue Marmor sins incurrere in pleores*, where, although *luerue* as it stands can hardly be right, it is more natural to take it as concealing some cognate of *lues* that, with Bücheler, to emend it away. And whatever we may think of the origin of Mars, it cannot be doubted that he had agricultural functions, indeed that he is connected in some manner with sowing, for in this very hymn he is invoked almost in the same breath with the Semunes.

Not only Mars but Quirinus was interested in agriculture. His flamen, besides his frequent appearance by the side of the Vestals, sacrifices to Acca Larentia (Gell. VII. 7), to Consus on the Consualia (Tert. *de spect.* 5), and, most important of all, to Robigus. In this last connection I would protest against the suggestion of Wissowa, *op. cit.* p. 155, that he acted merely because his regular functions took up so little time. If this was so, why was not some other unemployed priest, say the fl. Pomonalis or Falacer, called upon to do the work? Our only authority, Ovid (*Fasti* IV. 110), gives no hint that the presence of the flamen Quirinalis was not absolutely necessary, or that anyone else could have acted in his place. I would rather suppose some connection of Quirinus² with this curious ritual, whose most interesting feature is the sacrifice of a dog. That this is the result of a sort of bad pun on the name of the dog-star, as Ovid *l.c.* supposes, is indeed rightly denied by modern critics; nor is the *augurium caninum* otherwise connected with Sirius than by date, I think. From the fact that the victim at the *augurium* was a red dog, it seems to me a likely guess that Robigus' dog was red also, the colour of the dreaded 'rust.'

¹ Minerua is not an *indiges*, and so is out of place here. But cf. Appian, *Punica* 133, which, following Polybius no doubt, names Athena-Livy obviously draws upon the same author in the above passage, and we may rectify the mistake by supposing that Polybius explained Nerio by Athena, in the latter's capacity as a war-goddess. Cf. Wissowa, RKR², pp. 148, 208.

² Tert. *l.c.*, mentions Mars in this connection; *Numa Pompilius Marti et Robigini fecit*; but this is, apparently, a mere slip.

Departing a little from the main argument of this paper, I would here offer a suggestion as to the real meaning of this rite. We are familiar enough with corn-spirits in animal form, thanks to Mannhardt and Fraser. I believe that we have here a bad corn-spirit, one who destroys corn instead of making it grow, and is killed in order to get rid of him, not to let him transmigrate into a new and more vigorous body. The old corn-spirit is killed when his work is done and his incarnation, the ripe ears, may no longer stand; but Robigus in his dog-avatar is killed early in the year, in April, some time before the sacred spelt-harvest of the Vestals, to prevent him damaging the crop at all. So at Carseoli something—Ovid's corrupt text does not enable us to say exactly what—was done to another avatar of the red mildew, the fox (*Fast. IV. 711*); apparently the beast was burned to death. The conception of an evil power as something which could be killed, and so got finally rid of, in some incarnate form, was not strange to ancient magic; Apollonios of Tyana had a plague-demon stoned in the shape of an old man (*Philostr. Vita Apoll. IV. 10*). *Pax deorum* was indeed what the Roman craved, humbly enough, in the case of such mighty ones as Iuppiter and Quirinus; but in the case of one or two obnoxious demons it would appear to have been allowable to assail them *iusto pioque bello*. Later, when the idea of sacrifice as the giving of food to the gods swamped all other conceptions,¹ the respectable sheep was added, and the *exta* of the dog presented like those of a more normal victim; and long before that, it may well be, Quirinus was called in to lend his aid.

I have said that the dog-star had little or nothing to do with dog-sacrifice, or the killing of dog-demons; yet I think Ovid's fancy contains, if only by

accident, a hint of the truth. He clearly associates rust with hot weather, and rightly enough in a way, though presumably neither that nor any other fungus would prosper unless the atmosphere were also damp. The line of reasoning is this, I think: fire is hot and red (long after Robigus was forgotten, Giotto was indicating fire in his frescoes by a neat patch of red paint); rust is red (at least its spores are) and comes in hot weather; therefore rust is a kind of fire, and the red dog (we still speak of red cattle, meaning a warm brown colour) is fire-colour or rust-colour.

We can now, I think, find a place for a deity who is connected with seeds and yet with fire; *Lua*, the spirit of *lues*, can, among other things, blight the precious seed-corn, if she be not propitiated.

I would call attention in this connection to the loose use of the verb *ure*. If a crop, such as flax or poppies, which exhausts the soil, can be said to 'burn' it (*Virg. Georg. I. 78*), there is no need even to be particular to assign *Lua*'s evil activities to some sphere in which a firey-coloured fungus is involved.

But there is yet another and more literal kind of fire which can on occasion damage crops and much else. *Ferro atque igne uastare* was a commonplace of ancient warfare, horribly revived in our own day. We have, indeed, no proof that *Lua* was called in to help with her 'fire' in the destruction of such of the enemy's seed-corn as escaped the material activities of the army, but it is not unlikely, since we have already seen her busy in connection with another piece of war-magic, the 'sacrifice' of the arms. For that it was simply war-magic I am fairly convinced. If the arms were a present to the god, why were they not put in a temple? To burn food before a god is a different matter, for to the average Roman, or Greek, of periods whereof we have any record, the notion clearly was that the deities lived on the smoke or steam of the sacrifices. But in the case of captured arms, the motive seems rather to be the destruction by sympathetic magic of the other arms which are still

¹ Much harm has been done by scholars in trying to force all kinds of sacrifice into one formula, whether gift, communal meal, god-eating, or simple magical rite. All these interpretations have their value, and I doubt if we can say that one is more primitive than another. For the world in general certainly, for many individual peoples probably, several causes have been at work.

in possession of the enemy.¹ As to the gods invoked, Volcanus is clearly at home in an act involving destruction by fire; Mars and Neria are equally appropriate, that their greater potency may reinforce the spell; while Lua, who by reason of her 'burning' of the corn, or, if I am right, of its seeds, is perhaps called in as a sort of fire-goddess.

But in considering any Roman rite, we should always keep in view the maxim, *οὐ τρώσας καὶ λάσεται*. As Geneta Mana is the goddess of birth and also of death; as Janus is Patulcius Clusius, and so on, we may expect a god who can destroy by fire to help by fire also. One way of helping is clearly to burn up what is harmful. Thus we see Volcanus connected with the Tubilustrium, not, as Ovid imagines, because the trumpets are made by his art,² for he seems never to have been a god of smiths, but by the purifying virtues of his element. Compare also the purifying fires of the Parilia, the familiar torches of many ceremonies, such as marriage, and the purgatorial fires of many faiths, including that of Vergil. This may be wholly negative—there is something altogether bad, which we want taken away, and so we burn it. But that it is positive also is an idea not lightly to be dismissed. The most terrible of fires, the thunderbolt, may not only destroy but also confer deity.³ It is from a funeral pyre that Herakles mounts to heaven; Empedokles and Peregrinus alike⁴ sought immortality by the same route. Demeter at Eleusis and Isis at Byblos place in the fire the children on whom they wish to confer immortality; Thetis does the same,⁵ while Medea uses the closely allied method of a boiling cauldron. I have already mentioned the activity of the Vestals in agricultural rites. Possibly a subsidiary cause of the connection of fire and agriculture may have been the

utility, well understood by the ancients, of ashes as manure.⁶ And, to return to Robigus for a moment, whether my suggestion of the real significance of the sacrifice be right or wrong, this connection of war, fire, and agriculture, may help us to understand why the fl. Quirinalis in particular was chosen to perform the rite. Fire here drives out fire, the clean and beneficent fire of the warlike and agricultural deity fighting the impure flames of the hurtful daimon. We may, then, fairly suppose that Lua had a good side as well as a bad one in her activities (possibly, if we knew a little more about her, we might find some title suggesting it).

To sum up, we find Lua belonging to a group of deities whose functions, fairly distinct but often interlocking, concern the closely connected group of human activities—war, agriculture, and the use of fire; her functions appear to have been normally maleficent, but not necessarily or invariably so; and therefore we find her in the honourable company of Saturnus and Mars, propitiated and asked for help as they are, and not, as apparently Robigus was, attacked.

H. J. ROSE.

⁶ Virg. *Georg.* I. 80.

AESCHYLUS, PROMETHEUS VINCTUS 801.

τοιούτῳ μὲν σοι τούτῳ φρούριον λέγω.

The Scholia on this passage, and Hesychius, explain *φρούριον* as 'a danger to guard against' (Hesychius, *φρούριον προφύλαγμα*). As there is no other instance of this meaning, modern editors accept the explanation with some doubt, suggesting as an alternative the 'ordinary meaning' of 'guard' or 'garrison' (so Sikes and Wilson's commentary). But 'guard-post' (so Rackham) is nearer to the original meaning of 'fort' or 'citadel'—here, the region held by the Gorgons and Graiai. This rendering finds some support in Cicero's version (*Quaest. Tusc.* ii. 10) of a fragment from the *Προηγένεις Λυθρεον*.

I. 9. *Transverbératus castrum hoc Furiarum incolo.*

Welcklein—who accepts Hesychius' explanation of *φρούριον*—here annotates *castrum* as follows: 'etwa Ερυνών φρουρά nach, l. 143. Ερυνών ist dann metonymisch gebraucht ("Lager der Rache").' But *φρουρά* in the sense of *P. V.*, line 143, *φρουρά δέσποτον δχήσω*, is not an exact equivalent to either 'castrum' or 'Lager,' and *φρούριον* [*Προγένεις*] is a nearer parallel to 'castrum Furiarum.'

MARGARET E. HIRST.

¹ For a not dissimilar idea, see Plut. *quaest. Rom.* 37, and Jevons' introduction to his edition of Philemon Holland's translation, p. lxxxii.

² *Fast.* V. 726.

³ Diod. Sic. V. 52, 2.

⁴ Horace *A. P.* 465; *Luc. de mort. Peregr.* 29.

⁵ Hom. *Hymn. in Cer.* 239 ff.; Plut. *de Is. et Os.* 357 c; Lykophron 178-9. Cf. Dussaud, *Intr. à l'Hist. des Rel.*, p. 179.

GREEK ETYMOLOGIES: ἄηρ,
ἰχώρ, κομψός, οἶνος, χαλκός.

SIR WILLIAM RAMSAY writes (*Journ. of Roman Studies*, 1917, p. 268): 'There is a strong admixture of Anatolian words in Greek, and some remarkable similarities due to geographical contiguity.' The decipherment of the cuneiform Hittite tablets of Boghaz Keui is demonstrating the correctness of his remark and throwing light on the origin of a good many Greek words. Here are some examples:

(1) 'Ἄηρ has naturally been regarded as connected with ἄημι and ἀέλλα—it certainly was so by the Greeks themselves—although there are phonetic difficulties in regard to the termination, which, however, has been explained as due to assimilation to αἰθήρ. Now we find in one of the Boghaz Keui texts (*Keilschrifftexte aus Boghazkoi* IV. p. 76): AN ISTAR-gan MAT-E-as pakhkhanu uerā-zanda iskhūwāi, 'May Istar (or whatever was the corresponding Hittite name of the goddess) rain fire upon the land from heaven (*uera-z*)', a phrase borrowed from Sumerian and Semitic literature. There can be little doubt that in *uera* we have the Greek *a-Fep-*. The prothetic vowel (which is found before initial digamma in about a dozen words in Greek) will have been due to the analogy of ἄημι. Latin *aura* is a loan-word from *āvpa*, as Lithuanian *oras* is from *aura* itself. (Is the Greek χέω for σχεF-ω, Hitt. *iskhū*?).

(2) 'Ιχώρ has no Indo-European etymology. In the Hittite text we find *eskhar*, acc. *iskhani*, which the Sumerian and Assyrian vocabularies explain as 'red blood' in contradistinction to *máni* or 'white blood,' 'pus.'

(3) Sir William Ramsay (*J.R.S.*, 1917, p. 270) suggests that *κομψός*, 'a song with music,' is of Anatolian origin. He is now proved to be right. In the Hittite cuneiform texts *iskhami-yazi* signifies 'he sings' or 'chants.' *Κομψός* therefore represents an earlier *σκομψός*, the root being found in the Hittite (*i)skham*.

(4) It has long been believed that *οἶνος* is of Asianic origin. In the Hittite text the common word for 'wine' is *wiyanas*, and the name of the city Oinoanda, near Issos, is written

Wiyanuwanda. *Károunou*, which is the Assyrian *Karanu*, *kurun*, has been assimilated to *οἶνος*. In Assyrian the borrowed *wiyanas* became contracted into *īnu*, and in the Cappadocian tablets found near Kaisariyeh and belonging to about B.C. 2400, the proper name *Inâ*, 'the Vintner,' occurs frequently.

(5) *Χαλκός* again has no Indo-European etymology. In the Cappadocian tablets, which are about a thousand years earlier than the Boghaz Keui texts and are written in an Assyrian dialect, one of the places from which copper was brought is stated to be *Khalki* (Contenau, *Trente Tablettes Cappadociennes*, p. 86). In the Boghaz Keui texts themselves mention is made of 'the god *Khalkis*,' a sort of Hephaestus.

TWO PHRYGIAN WORDS.

In one of the Phrygian inscriptions at the Midas city, published by Ramsay (*J.H.S.*, 1888, p. 380), a word occurs which must be read *aFevos*. Ramsay has pointed out that it necessarily signifies 'son'; the difficulty has been to find an etymology for it. It offers, however, a close analogy to *ἥλιος*. According to Hesychius the Pamphylian and Kretan form of *ἥλιος* was *ἀβέλιος*. This represents an earlier *ἀσφελιος* corresponding to Skt. *suryas* (= *sūlyas*), Lat. *sol*, Welsh *haul*, with a prothetic vowel before the double consonant. Similarly *aFevos* represents an earlier *ασFενος* corresponding to Skt. *sūnus*, Russ. *suinu*, our son. Cf. *īvīs* for *ἰσνις*.

A title which occurs several times in the Midas inscriptions is *ακενανο-λαFos*, also written *ακινανο-λαFos*, the second element of which is found in the title *λαF-αλτνει* given to Midas 'the king.' In Hittite, *akananis* means 'pricot,' while in the native Lydian inscriptions discovered by the American excavators at Sardes *lfs* appears to signify 'God.' I would identify this with the Phrygian *lavos* as well as with the second element in the Greek *βασι-λεύς*, the first element of which, however, remains as obscure as ever.¹

A. H. SAYCE.

¹ Cf. The name of Laocoön; *κανεύ* is 'priest,' 'priestess,' in the Greek inscriptions of Sardes, and Ramsay has shown that 'Ἄττηδο-καος' means 'Attegos' or Atty's priests.' *Lavaltaei* has long since been compared with the Greek Laertes.

PROFESSOR HOUSMAN ON
GREEK ASTROLOGY.

EVERYONE must agree with Mr. Garrod's observation (*Class. Rev.* XXXV. p. 39): 'In the wide and dark circle of astrological learning, Mr. Housman works at the centre, and the rest of us do but play about the circumference.' But I hope I shall be excused for pointing out a mistake in Professor Housman's learned preface (p. vii) to Manilius, Book IV. Referring to the question of their *συγγένεια* with consecutive *δεκανοί*, he states that 'the planets succeed and recur in the usual descending sequence', and cites in support, among other authorities, also *Catal. Cod. Astrol. Graec.* II. pp. 153-7 (forming Cap. IX. of the *Introduction to Astrology* by 'Αχμέτ of about the middle of the tenth century A.D.). But the plan of 'Αχμέτ is to assign *συγγένεια* between the *δεκανοί* (= *πρόσωπα*) of a *ζώδιον*, and the *οἰκοδεσπόται* of its *τρίγωνον*, by regarding for this purpose each *ζώδιον* as the first of its *τρίγωνον*, and the *τριγωνοκράτορες* as succeeding in that order. Says he, for instance (*op. cit.* p. 153): . . . 'Ο δὲ τρίτος δεκανὸς Κριοῦ τοῦ Διός (not τῆς 'Αφροδίτης), διότι οἶκος αὐτοῦ Τοξότης <έστιν> . . . Καὶ ὁ πρώτος δεκανὸς Ταύρου 'Αφροδίτης (not 'Ερμοῦ) . . . and we may add, διότι οἶκος αὐτῆς Ταύρου ἐστί· . . . 'Ο δεύτερος δεκανὸς Ταύρου 'Ερμοῦ (not Σελήνης), διότι οἶκος αὐτοῦ Παρθένος ἐστίν· κ.τ.λ. His method is identical with Varāhamihira's (*Bṛhajjātaka*, I. 11), who wrote about the middle of the sixth century A.D.: *dṛeskāñāḥ syuḥ svabhavaṇasutratrīkronādhipānām*. And Utpala (in his *Commentary* dated A.D. 966) quotes (*ad Bṛhajjātaka*, I. 12) Satya (fourth century A.D.?), confirming Varāhamihira. It will interest Professor Franz Cumont to learn that both Satya and Varāhamihira, though authors Indian, voice the purer (*sit venia verbo*) tradition of the so-called Hellenistic epoch.

Another method of allotting *συγγένεια* between *πρόσωπα* and *ἀστήρες* is also noticed in the *Bṛhajjātaka*, I. 12: *Kecit (τινὲς) tu . . . dṛeskāñasamjñām aphi varṇayanti (συγγράφοντι) svadvādaśaikādaśarāśipānām*. By this scheme the

three successive *πρόσωπα* of a *ζώδιον* are assigned in order to the *οἰκοδεσπόται* of the three *ζώδια* beginning with it, but counted west. Utpala remarks that by *τινὲς* Varāhamihira refers to the Yavaneśvara (οὐ Έλληνικός βασιλεύς) by reason of the latter propounding the scheme in a verse. This Yavaneśvara, who bore the name of Āśphujidhvaja ('Αφροδιτοσημαλος), was evidently a half-Greek of Buddhist persuasion, and wrote, sometime between A.D. 93 (*Utpala, ad Bṛhajjātaka*, VII. 9) and A.D. 269 (*Journ. Asiatic Soc. Bengal*, LXVI, Part I, p. 311), a metrical treatise in Sanskrit on *Greek Apotelesmatics*, though bringing together under that title only a rehash of the technics of the Indo-Greek and Indo-Parthian transformations of it. He was both a king and a monk.

The *μορφή* of the *δεκανός*, as drawn by 'Αχμέτ, is also in closest agreement with what we find in Varāhamihira (*Bṛhajjātaka*, Cap. XXVII. *passim*), who, however, mentions *thrice* (*cap. cit.* vv. 2, 9, *et 21*) that his *δεκανομορφαί* are based on Greek teaching. This Greek teaching, Utpala adds pointedly in a note to ver. 21, was that of *παλαιοὶ Ελληνες* (*purāṇa-yavanāḥ*)—that is to say, belonged to the Hellenistic epoch. Varāhamihira was indirectly drawn upon by 'Απομάσαρ, in 848 A.D., in his chapter on the *δεκανοί* (edited in Arabic in Boll's *Sphaera*, pp. 482-539; and in Greek in *Catal. Codic. Astrol. Graec.* V. i. pp. 156-169), and therefore most probably by 'Αχμέτ also in his chapter on the same theme. It is strange that Boll has nowhere called attention to Varāhamihira's striking and repeated mention of a Greek source for his *δεκανομορφαί*.

Professor Housman remarks twice (Manilius, Book IV., pref., pp. vi, vii) that Manilius is the only astrologer to introduce the canon of *συγγένεια* between *δεκανοί* and *ζώδια*. But Varāhamihira's Greek tradition, which is certainly pre-Hipparchian, and very probably also pre-Hypsiclean, had, as may be seen from the trend of the precepts in his *Bṛhajjātaka*, recognised such *συγγένεια*, nay, had put it to practical use in the art for which it was intended. This tradition is yet

to be fully restored from the literary remains of the Hellenistic epoch now in course of examination for some years by classical philologists like Cumont, Boll, Kroll, and the rest.

V. V. RAMANA-ŠASTRIN.

'SATIRA TOTA NOSTRA EST.'

So far as I know, Quintilian is generally understood to claim that 'Satire is entirely Roman.' Is this a possible translation? It is now a common-place that the great bulk of Horatian and (in all probability) Lucilian Satire is drawn, both in subject-matter and in treatment, from the popular sermon and parody of the Hellenistic age. Horace is thinking of his own work in *Ep.* II. 2. 60, 'ille Bioneis sermonibus et sale nigro.'

The metrical form is not in itself a sufficient title to originality. We have lost the volumes of the blear-eyed Crispinus; but the Ptolemaic papyri have restored something of Phoenix of Colophon. And the 'unde et quo, Catius' was anticipated by Archestratus, who had sketched in hexameters the 'vitae praecpta beatae.'

I do not think that Quintilian had the notion of originality in his mind at all. He speaks of 'alterum illud etiam prius satirae genus'—the satires of Varro, confessedly Menippean. The debt of Plautus and Terence to the Greeks was enormous and avowed; yet 'in comoedia maxime claudicamus' is based on purely stylistic grounds. Quintilian is thinking of final achievement. He pits the Roman writers against the Greeks throughout. 'In elegy we challenge the Greeks—Varius' *Thyestes* will stand comparison with any of the Greek Tragedies—'non historia cesserit Graecis'—one need not hesitate to match Sallust against Thucydides.' 'Satira tota nostra est' is in the same strain. The Roman writers so far outstripped their Greek originals that they are first, the Greeks nowhere. In the contest the element of Satire is entirely in our favour, on our side. Quintilian writes 'nostra,' not 'nostras.' I take the phrase to be similar to that in *Pro Milone*, § 3, 'reliqua

vero multitudo, quae quidem est civium, tota nostra est.'

There is something to be said for that contention. Zola has defined a novel as life seen through a temperament. The difference between the Roman satire and the Greek diatribe is the difference between the Roman temperament and the Greek. Bion had a keen and biting wit: Horace the more saving grace of humour.

W. RENNIE.

PROPRIE COMMUNIA
DICERE. . .'

NETTLESHIP (*Lectures and Essays*, 1885, p. 178) was surely right in holding that the lines of Horace, *A.P.* 128-152, refer to epic poetry; 129 is not inconsistent with this, for it means that Piso is acting more wisely in writing the tragedy he is at work on than he would be if he wrote epics on the subjects in question. *Communia* is a legal term meaning 'unclaimed,' 'unappropriated' (cf. *Cic. de off.* I §20, where *communia* is opposed to *priuata*, and the instances in *L.* and *S.*, s.v. *proprius* I a, where *proprius* is opposed to *communis*.) Here *communia* are evidently 'unclaimed subjects' (Nettleshop)—that is, subjects which no one, at least no Roman, has yet treated ('ignota indictaque'); *proprie* means 'so that they will become one's own.' In 'publica matieres priuati iuris erit' we have the same antithesis as in 'proprie communia dicere,' and therefore *publica matieres* must mean the same thing as *communia*. But the lines which follow, especially 133-4 'nec uerbo . . . interpres' and 'imitator,' show that *publica matieres* means Greek poetry which is common property because anyone may borrow from it or imitate it. This seems at first sight inconsistent with 'ignota indictaque' (130). But we must remember that in the view of Horace and his contemporaries originality consisted merely in borrowing from Greek poets whom no other Roman had laid under contribution (cf. *Epp.* I. 19, 21-2 'libera per uacuum posui uestigia princeps, | non aliena meo pressi pede.') There *uacuum*, which is also a legal term (cf. *Cic. de off.* I

§21 'sunt autem priuata nulla natura, sed aut utere occupatione, ut qui quondam in *nacua* uenerunt, aut . . . and the instances from Gaius and the Digest in L. and S. s.v. II D), means the same as *communia* and *publica materies* here—namely, Greek poems which were no one's property in the sense that no Roman had translated or imitated them, while *aliena* corresponds

to *priuati iuris*, poems which belong to some person who has succeeded in imitating them. Hence *ignota* can mean only 'unknown to readers of Latin' and *indicta* 'unsung by Roman poets.' Similarly in *Carm. III. 25. 7-8* 'dicam insigne, recens, adhuc | indicatum ore alio' merely means something that no Roman poet has treated.

R. L. DUNBAIN.

REVIEWS

GREEKS AND BARBARIANS.

Greeks and Barbarians. By J. A. K.

THOMSON. London: George Allen and Unwin, Ltd., 1921. 8s. 6d. net. MR. THOMSON's theme opens out as we read, and comes at last by way of Thermopylae and Cunaxa to a discussion of Classical and Romantic. In the meantime he has brought us face to face with Greek Freedom and Greek Sophrosyne. Why is the Greek so different from everybody else? Probably because he has managed so much better than anybody else to combine things which Nature meant to go together, but which everybody except himself (and herself) saw to be fundamentally inconsistent—Law and Freedom. He could be loyal to Law to a degree to infuriate neo-Celts and neo-Georgians, and where he soared into Freedom he did not drag, as they do, a string of rags and tatters of broken laws trailing after him. No men ever got so much out of Law or added so much to it, drew so much inspiration from Freedom or took it so naturally and sensibly—at least if you except their politics. (No doubt we shall have some high-born eugenist—if this is not tautology—telling us that Greek political troubles were the work of alien proletariats, unhappily not exterminated by the conquering race. Compare the *plebs* at Rome. The eugenist is really more akin to the Prussian than to the Greek.)

However, to return to Mr. Thomson, his book has the signal merit of being practically useless for examination purposes—at any rate east of Bletchley,

for I cannot speak of the regions beyond. But if to set people thinking about Greeks and barbarians was his object in writing the book, which he names after these two great divisions of mankind, he seems likely to achieve it. He raises, or makes his reader raise—I am not quite sure which—the eternal question of how the Greeks occurred at all in the scheme of things, and why the rest of us are so unlike them.

He does well to tell the tales of Leonidas and Xenophon again. Xenophon he finds very like Sir Walter Scott (whom he prefers perhaps too fervently)—sharing the tastes of a country gentleman, with a love of literature and history, especially with a flavour of romance. 'Xenophon wanted to be too many things,' he was not born to command, was always more or less under the influence of someone else, was a poor judge of men and the movement of affairs—but he was born to write. Even that last Englishmen deny or forget, though Andrew Lang paid them a very high compliment when he said that Xenophon was the most English of the ancients.

Mr. Thomson makes an interesting point when he suggests that for us Romance is associated with lawlessness—is 'gone with the raggle-taggle gypsies, oh!'—but for the Greeks with the bringing of order out of disorder. As Xenophon, to come back to him, said to his wife (or Ischomachus to his): 'When all the boots and shoes, of whatever sizes, are in a row, how

beautiful it is!' Free Centaurs galloping on Pelion, cannibal Minotaurs, the picturesque and the ultimately defeated, he says, win our bookish sympathies; but, as he suggests, the people who lived near them 'grew surprisingly tired of them.' So one does, indeed, of Celtic leaders, and neo-Georgian poets, and people like Cuchulain, whose anatomy is not equal to their temperament. (How, by the way, Mr. Thomson can deal so gently with the horrible page he quotes of Cuchulain, with 'his lungs and lights fluttering in his mouth' for sheer rage, I do not understand.) He explains that 'to the ancient world law and order were the exception, while us they interest about as much as a couple of boiled potatoes; we are for the Open Road and somewhere East of Suez.' The Greek develops an unsuspected likeness to Mr. Chesterton's poet of order in *The Man who was Thursday*.

From Sophrosyne, the Greekest of virtues, Mr. Thomson passes, as I have said, to a consideration of the Classical and the Romantic, which occupies a quarter or more of his book. He suggests that 'Classical art is an expression of Hellenism and Romantic art of Barbarism, so far as Barbarism is capable of expression'—a definition which only needs to be quoted to provoke qualification. But I am not going to qualify it, for his next sentence is autobiographical and might come from my own autobiography: 'Here I feel the want of something beyond my own instinct in discerning the Classical

from the Romantic,' though my autobiography admits even greater nescience. All I will say here is that the discussion is interesting and stimulating. It might annoy the neo-Georgians, but they will probably not read it; and it certainly confirms me in the error or rectitude—in this age of chaos it is much the same thing—of my own ways.

One riddle of Mr. Thomson's I cannot guess the answer to: 'What do you suppose,' he says—for he is always slipping his arm into yours and talking to you as if you were a human being, and not another book, which was not the way in my youth—'what do you suppose Aristophanes would have said about Tennyson? If the answer is not at once obvious, the reason must be the difficulty that would arise in getting a Greek of Aristophanes' time to understand the Victorian timidities at all.' The last bit I can understand; I don't get the rest, as Mr. Thomson might say. I wish the *Saturday Westminster* would offer a prize for the best twenty lines, dialogue, monologue, parabasis, or lyric, by Aristophanes describing Tennyson.

I hope I have said enough to show that I have found something in Mr. Thomson's book which I shall be glad to think about again, and which I should wish my friends, too, to think over; and I don't know that there is much higher praise for a book of essays than to say that it refreshes and stimulates you, that it makes you see the Greeks again alive, and prompts the wish to know them better.

T. R. GLOVER.

THE FOUNDATIONS OF CLASSIC ARCHITECTURE.

The Foundations of Classic Architecture.
By HERBERT LANGFORD WARREN.
Quarto. One Volume. Pp. xiv + 357.
121 illustrations. New York: The
Macmillan Company, 1919. 32s. net.
THIS is an excellent book. It was
designed as the first of a series of
volumes covering the whole history of
architecture, but this great scheme was
unhappily cut short by the author's
death in 1917 at the age of sixty.
There are five chapters, dealing with
Egypt, Mesopotamia, Persia, the

Aegean, and Greece to the end of the
fifth century, B.C. Professor Warren
was an architect, and he writes of
ancient architecture with a firm grasp
of realities; and, unlike some architects,
he has mastered the facts.

The prehellenic sections are broad
in treatment and very interesting. In
the Greek chapters his most obvious
purpose is to minimise the influence of
wood technique on Doric, while em-
phasising it for Ionic. Much of his
reasoning seems to ignore the possibility

that the pre-Doric tradition was based on thicker timber than the pre-Ionic; and it is unfortunate that he entirely ignores Thermon. Moreover, in his anxiety to discredit the features of Doric which suggest wooden originals, he overrates the evidence for the archaic omission of triglyphs. He writes (p. 197): 'There is pretty clear evidence that some early entablatures had no triglyphs on the frieze (Cadacchio on Corfu, Temple in Syracuse, "Temple of Ceres" at Paestum), and it is quite conceivable that the motive first appeared as a painted decorative motive in the friezes.' It must be noted that he is arguing not for the total omission of the frieze member ('in Doric the frieze is seldom, if ever, omitted,' p. 294), but for the use of a smooth frieze without triglyphs. For this the evidence is far from clear. It is now known that Cadacchio had no frieze member at all (Warren seems to follow Railton's obsolete restoration); while for the Temple at Syracuse there is no evidence except the absence of *regulae* and the close spacing of the columns. It is possible that at Syracuse, as at Cadacchio, there was no frieze member at all (abnormally close spacing makes difficulties similar to those of abnormally wide spacing); or the intercolumnar triglyphs may have been omitted. For the 'Temple of Ceres' Warren argues partly from the absence of *regulae*, but chiefly from the fact that the triglyphs are inserted slabs of softer

stone, and hence, on his view, a later addition. This reasoning ignores the fact that all the chief carved members both of 'Ceres' and of the 'Basilica' are of this softer stone; it also ignores Koldewey's demonstration that the structure of this frieze is on that cantilever principle, which is repeated in the Propylaea of Mnesicles. Koldewey considers and rejects the view that the frieze has been tampered with.

A fact that the manuscript was not revised by the author should not be forgotten, but one or two omissions must be mentioned. The prehistoric Thessalian buildings are ignored, except for an allusion, unintelligible to the ordinary reader, to 'some early megarons such as that of Dimini' (p. 203), but this slip would no doubt have been rectified. More serious is Warren's silence about the evidence upsetting the date of the Olympian Heraeum.

For the illustrations the editor is chiefly responsible. They are mostly good, but one or two are open to criticism. In particular, it is difficult to believe that Warren would have passed Bühlmann's restoration of the Tiryns megaron (Fig. 37). Its pseudo-Doric frieze is an embodiment of the views which he most disliked. Nor should Fig. 58, with its obsolete ground-plans, have been borrowed from Anderson and Spiers. But the illustrations prepared under Warren's own direction (such as Figs. 86 and 94) are excellent.

D. S. ROBERTSON.

HOMERIC GREEK: A BOOK FOR BEGINNERS.

Homeric Greek: A Book for Beginners.
By CLYDE PHARR, Ph.D. (Yale),
Professor of Greek in South-Western
Presbyterian University. One vol.
Octavo. Pp. xlii + 391. Two maps,
ten plates, and numerous woodcuts.
Boston, New York, Chicago: D. C.
Heath and Co.; London: G. G.
Harrap and Co. 8s. 6d. net.

THIS is an interesting book. It is not, as the title at first suggests, a study of Homeric phraseology from a literary standpoint (on which, by the way, an interesting treatise might be written), but an attempt to provide a 'First

Greek Book' on the basis of Homeric rather than Attic Greek. Dr. Pharr is a real enthusiast, and such are always pleasant reading.

The book consists of three parts: (1) In the introduction (pp. xiii-xlii) Dr. Pharr states his case in favour of Homeric, as against Attic, Greek as a basic study; (2) pp. 1-189 contain an edition of *Iliad* I., with vocabularies and exercises; (3) the remainder of the book contains a grammar and a vocabulary.

It is naturally the introductory polemic that first arrests attention.

There is much to be said for Dr. Pharr's contention. To begin Greek with Homer has the following obvious advantages: We are in a world of simple sentences, and we are able to plunge at once into first-rate literature. Dr. Pharr further urges (1) that the irregularities of formation in Homeric Greek are fewer than in Attic, and that Attic forms are explicable from Homeric, not *vice versa*; (2) that the vocabulary acquired is better as an introduction to Greek literature generally.

If the alternative is (as Dr. Pharr seems to imply for American schools) between Homer and dreary *parasangs* of *Anabasis*, let us have Homer by all means. Fortunately it is not so. But it may be questioned whether *Iliad* I.-VI. is the best portion to choose. Would not *Odyssey* IX.-XII. (or, if this be too short, VI.-XII.) prove a more interesting First Greek Book? But there is much to be said in favour of the established study of Attic.

In the second part of the book the beginner, after fourteen preliminary lessons, embarks on the *Iliad*. The annotation is very complete, leaving in fact little to the initiative of the teacher. It would seem hardly necessary to reprint at length quite so much of the O.T.; and Dr. Pharr's zeal for colloquial vigour betrays him at times into a lack of dignity in translation. 'But shut up and sit down' (l. 565) is not precisely a model for students. There are some other points in the commentary that might be modified with advantage. In l. 28 $\mu\eta\ o\bar{u}\ \chi\bar{p}a\bar{i}\sigma\mu\eta$ should be explained. A long note on 115 might be omitted with advantage, and much of that on 246. On 307 it would be truer to say that the patronymic is in Homer virtually a surname. More might be said in criticism of details; but it has already been indicated that Dr. Pharr's notes err chiefly in the direction of superfluity.

The exercises for translation from English are a good and essential feature of the book. Though they might be perhaps improved.

In the final portion of the book, Grammar, there is much to note. We must be content with a few main points. P. 217: a wrong account is given of the formation of *ε\tau\tau\alpha\tau\os*. The general principles of ablaut, of the thematic vowel (for which a convenient symbol is used), and of sonant consonants, are correctly stated (pp. 220, 221); but the student is not told in what parts of the verb the different stems occur. In the note on p. 221 the origin of *β\ev\θ\os*, *π\ev\θ\os*, is incorrectly stated. In § 668 it should have been stated that nominative masculines in *ā* are really vocative. In § 800 add that the short-vowel subjunctive is limited to non-thematic tenses, and invariable in these. In the syntax, case-usages would be better treated under the separate headings of the absorbed cases; there is no need to darken counsel by teaching a boy that *ē* and *σ\uv* govern the same case. No mention occurs of the vague-local genitive, or of the internal accusative except under the misleading term 'cognate.' Other omissions occur. The use of the article as relative and its limitations do not seem to be explained, nor the generalising *τ\epsilon*. Some of these omissions may be, in a book for beginners, intentional.

In conclusion, we may say that Dr. Pharr's book, in spite of minor imperfections, does really represent a praiseworthy attempt at a new method, and anyone teaching Greek on the 'epic system' would find it, not indeed indispensable, but a saver of much labour. Nor must we omit a word of praise for the illustrations, whose charm is not diminished by their fascinating irrelevance.

FRANK CARTER.

LATIN PHONETICS.

Manuel de Phonétique latine. Par A. C. JURET, Professeur à l'Université de Strasbourg. Pp. 390. Paris: Librairie Hachette, 1921.

A FRENCHMAN, Professor Meillet, now holds the throne of Comparative Philo-

logy. Another Frenchman, to whom this book is dedicated, the veteran Professor L. Havet, is one of the few persons who are as familiar with Comparative Philology as with Latin Literature (and these are only two of the

fields over which his wide knowledge ranges). This book, by a pupil of Meillet and Havet, gives good promise of what Strasburg University in its new career is going to accomplish.

Professor Juret has made a thorough study of Phonetics. That is where he differs from the ordinary compiler of a book on the Latin Language. When he tells us that *gn-* became *n-* in Latin (*gnosco*, *nosco*), or that final *d* was dropped after a long vowel (*terrād*, *terrā*), he knows precisely (and makes his readers know) what pronunciation by Roman lips these changes imply. And therefore this manual is a real boon; for the Gradgrind manner of the ordinary compiler is oppressive. The reader demands some relief from the long lists of Changes of Sound (with Examples); and this relief can be given either by quotations from Latin Literature which show him what the Romans themselves thought of these changes, or else by clear explanations of each sound, so clear that he can imitate the changes with his own lips. The literary side I have tried to present in my *Latin Language*; the phonetic side is presented here.

This, then, is the general character of the book, a *phonetic* account, by an expert phonetician, of the changes of Latin forms. I will not enter into details; for everyone should get the book and read it himself. Its French

clarity and light touch make it more interesting reading than the last German manual (by Sommer). The same qualities are found in an excellent article in the new number of the *Mémoires de la Société de Linguistique* (XXII. iv., p. 174), by another pupil of Havet, Marouzeau, *Notes sur la Formation du Latin Classique*, which I would strongly recommend to all students of Latin in this country. For it is high time that Latin Linguistics be restored to their former place in our studies. It is dangerous to neglect them.

But M. Juret's book is capable of improvement. He is not quite at home in Latin Comedy; and since the language of Latin Comedy is eminently the spoken, as opposed to the literary language, this is a real drawback. And he is often too deferential to the opinions of others. If M. Havet told M. Juret that French *guéret* proved *vervactum* to have been pronounced *ver(u)-actum*, just as *animum adverto* was pronounced *anim(um)-adverto* (*veru* presumably meaning 'goad'), then it was certainly M. Juret's duty to make pious record of this clever suggestion. But it was equally his duty to explain to his readers how this theory can be reconciled with the other Romance forms of the word—Span. *barbecho*, Port. *barbeito*, Sardinian *barvattu*. This he has not done.

W. M. LINDSAY.

PLOTINUS.

Plotinus. Second and Third Enneads.
Translated by STEPHEN MACKENNA.

Lee Warner, 1921. 22s. net.

THIS is the second volume of a complete translation of the Enneads; the first appeared in 1917, and the third is announced for next month.

Those only who have attempted to translate from Plotinus can realise the magnitude and difficulty of the task which Mr. Mackenna has undertaken as the main work of his life. Not only does the cruelly elliptical style of the great Neoplatonist make him the most difficult of all Greek authors; it is almost more difficult to turn him into readable English. Mr. Mackenna has surmounted both obstacles. I have

tested his translation in all the most crabbed parts of the Second and Third Enneads, and the places where he seems to me to have missed the full meaning of a word or phrase are so few and so unimportant that I do not think it worth while to call attention to them. His translation is always lucid and pleasant to read, and in the purple patches where Plotinus writes, as he occasionally does, like a man inspired, Mr. Mackenna also rises and gives us real eloquence. It must be clearly stated that this gigantic labour of love deserves the most respectful recognition by all scholars.

The terminology of Plotinus presents a problem to the translator. Mr. Mac-

kenna has rightly protested against the pedantic rule that a Greek word must always be rendered by the same English word; but I think he has carried this liberty too far. I do not see that anything is gained by translating *δαιμόνες* usually by 'spirits,' but sometimes by 'celestials' or 'supernals,' both of them infelicitous words. And the chief technical terms of the philosophy, such as *νοῦς*, ought, I think, to have one English equivalent. What that equivalent should be is not so certain. Mr. Mackenna's 'Intellectual Principle' and 'Authentic Existent' are cumbrous. I prefer 'Spirit' for *νοῦς*, both because in Christian Greek philosophy *πνεῦμα* is practically equivalent to *νοῦς*, and because, as long as people persist in talking nonsense about the 'intellectualism' of the school of Plato, it is worth anything to avoid a word charged with such misleading associations. However, Mr. Mackenna has carefully thought out his choice of words, and no choice is free from objection.

The second volume contains no notes at all. In the first, he tells us that he has not invariably followed Volkmann's text, and that he has more than once ventured on emendations of his own. Obviously, every deviation from the text on which the translation is based ought to be mentioned in a footnote, and any new reading ought to be given in Greek at the foot of the page. Mr. Mackenna seems to have determined never to use the Greek alphabet in his book, which is surely a mistake.

It is impossible to make a thoroughly satisfactory translation of Plotinus without some textual criticism. The text is in a worse condition than the translator (in his prolegomena to Vol. I.) realises. Mr. Mackenna, with his minute knowledge of the diction and doctrine of Plotinus, should certainly be able to make some valuable suggestions for improving the text. One example will show how much remains to be done.

Enn. 3. 9. 3. ἀλλ' οὐ θεοὶ τὸ πρώτον ἐπέκεινα ὄντες. ὁ δὲ νοῦς τὰ ὄντα καὶ ἔστι κίνησις ἐνταῦθα καὶ στάσις. Müller, following Kirchhoff, omits ἀλλ' οὐ, and translates, 'Gott ist der Erste über dem Sein; der Geist ist das Seiende, und hier ist Bewegung und Ruhe'—a bad blunder, for Plotinus certainly did not put the gods 'über dem Sein.' His rendering requires *θεός* and *ὄντος*, which perhaps he proposes to read. Mr. Mackenna fares no better. 'But the First is not to be envisaged as made up from gods of a transcendent order. No; the Authentic Existents constitute the Intellectual Principle with which motion and rest begin.' The first part of this is nonsense, and in the second part he leaves out *ἐνταῦθα*. Volkmann sees that the passage is corrupt, but gives it up. The remedy is, however, very simple. The corruption lies in *θεοὶ*, which is quite out of place in this context. We must read ἀλλ' οὐ νοεῖ τὸ πρώτον ἐπέκεινα ὄντος. This is the thesis of the paragraph.

W. R. INGE.

THE OEDIPUS TYRANNUS OF SOPHOCLES.

The Oedipus Tyrannus of Sophocles.
Translated and explained by J. T. SHEPPARD, M.A. One vol. 8vo. Pp. lxxix + 179. Cambridge University Press, 1920. 20s. net.

THIS is a work of consummate scholarship; that is, it presents blend of wide learning, clear thought, and spiritual sympathy with the author whom it expounds. It is not, however, a complete edition of the *Oedipus Tyrannus*, and for excellent reasons. Jebb's commentary still holds the field in many important departments of Sophoclean scholarship.

Even of metre and rhythm this is true, although some English scholars, notably of course Walter Headlam, have repudiated vigorously the methods of J. H. H. Schmidt, whom Jebb closely followed. But no one has superseded Schmidt by a clear and detailed treatment of the Sophoclean lyrics; Mr. Sheppard, for example, leaves this topic practically untouched. Nor was there occasion for him to attempt a new critical or linguistic commentary. We therefore find here little about MSS., grammar, or idiom;

or example, the note on that extremely difficult sentence, *οὐ γὰρ ἀν μακράν κτέ* (vv. 220 f.), is in itself quite inadequate.

What, then, is the precise value of this edition? It has two great merits. First, it insists on studying 'the normal Greek ideas involved' (p. xii). Second, it demonstrates from moment to moment the psychological condition of the persons and the manner in which this psychology shapes the action.

Of these two topics the former is handled admirably, but at unnecessary length; for instance, the notes on pp. 140 and 156 illustrate with uncalled-for copiousness 'the connection of *ἀσφάλεια* with *εὐλάβεια*', and the dictum that 'a wise man is moderate in adversity as in prosperity.' This rather deleterious abundance is most marked in the Introduction, which in sixty-five pages gives us two new points, and two only; though one agrees that the first is interesting and the second important. The first is that v. 889 (*εἰ μὴ τὸ κέρδος κερδανεῖ δικαίως*) 'can be properly said to refer to Oedipus.' Mr. Sheppard's proof may be thus summarised. There was a definite description of the Tyrant present in all men's minds, and one element in it was greed of gain. Now, the Chorus have some reason to fear that Oedipus is changing from a beneficent King into a Tyrant. In this lyric they therefore discuss tyrants, with him in their mind, and mention greed, though Oedipus is not greedy, because no one could discuss tyrants without mentioning it. What Mr. Sheppard has proved is not (as he supposes) that v. 889 is really relevant, but that the Chorus are justified in talking irrelevantly.

The other portion of the Introduction possesses far greater value. In v. 1513, where the MSS. give *οὐ καιρὸς ἀεὶ ξῆν τοῦ βίου δὲ λάθονος*, and Jebb reads *οὐ καιρὸς *έᾳ ξῆν, τοῦ βίου δὲ λάθονος*, Mr. Sheppard reads *οὐ καιρὸς ἀεὶ ξῆν, β.δ.λ.*, developing in his note and at length in his Introduction the view that *καιρός* here and often means the Modest Measure. (The light thus thrown on Pindar *Pyth.* II. 110, *ῶν ἔραται καιρὸν διδούς*, is particularly welcome.) In this way, after a careful

and fascinating study of the idea in earlier literature, the editor is able to show that the Exodus of the O.T. is not intolerably painful, as Murray and Wilamowitz-Moellendorff have found it, but filled with quiet sad beauty. 'Oedipus was great, and wise, and fortunate. In his calamity he has now learnt that the best is found not in greatness but in quiet happiness. . . . And for a Greek this thought is expressed by the words which are inscribed on the temple of the Delphic Apollo, the presiding divinity of our play, *Nothing too much*' (p. lx).

But the notes are the finest part of the book, a splendid presentation of the 'feel' of the action, a presentation which rests not only upon sound scholarship and industry, but also upon two qualifications not less vital—a sense of what human beings are really like, and experience derived from the performance at Cambridge. Let me give two examples almost at random: the note on v. 11 (*δεῖσαντες η στέρεσαντες*) and that on v. 903 ff.

I proceed now to details where I find myself in disagreement with Mr. Sheppard.

INTRODUCTION.

P. xvii. It may well be doubted whether 'the suggestion which makes Euryganeia a second wife' of Oedipus and the mother of his children is due to 'a late and stupid misunderstanding.' See Bethe, *Thebanische Heldenlieder*, I.

P. xxv. 'Whether he [Sophocles] believed in prophecies or not really matters little.' True, no doubt; but the form of the statement happens to be regrettably curt. A momentous feature of Sophocles' dramaturgy which still awaits study is the importance of the oracles.

P. lxiii. (Note 1). Is not the point of *τοῦ βίου εὐ ἔρεντι ὡς τὰ παρ' ἡμῖν* and *βίος ἀρκέων*, not that Tellos, etc., had less than much, but rather that they had more than a little?—that Herodotus is anticipating the Aristotelian view of *τὰ ἔκτος ἀγαθά* as necessary to happiness?

TRANSLATION.

Though this is admirable on the whole—see, for instance, the vigorous version

of vv. 584 ff.—it contains some ugly lines: 'Pitying not such a petitioning' (p. 3); 'You must not turn What matters little into a great wrong' (p. 41); 'A stroke of Fortune, very strange, and yet . . .' (p. 49); 'If doings such as these be countenanced' (p. 57); 'Ask your own feet. They best can answer that' (p. 65); 'Has any man here present knowledge of . . .' (*ibid.*); 'Enjoy her pride in her fine family' (p. 67).

NOTES.

Ver. 6. A still more striking quotation, perhaps, would have been Eur. *Iph. Aul.* 337-348.

Ver. 18. *Philoctetes* 138-142 is very much to the purpose.

Ver. 25. To say that Thuc. (II. 47. 3) uses 'an obvious word' when he writes *έγκατασκήνω* seems a serious error. The word is rare, and one can hardly doubt that he is quoting *Persae* 514; the quotation throws light upon the limits of his rationalism.

Ver. 38. Mr. Sheppard unduly minimises the marked self-confidence—it is almost arrogance—which Oedipus shows early in the play. Observe, e.g., the frequency of *έγώ*, *έμοις*, etc., in his proclamation (vv. 216 ff.).

Ver. 54. This is no doubt a question of one's personal sense of style and idiom. I myself feel rather strongly that *ἄρχω* and *κρατῶ* here have precisely the same meaning. In any case, it should not be said that 'the danger of the despotic frame of mind' is 'quite certainly' indicated.

Ver. 110. The significant rhyme is not noted (nor by Jebb).

Ver. 318. 'A consideration of *Il. I.* 76 f. and of *Antig.* 1031, 1060 will show that the reluctance to speak is not assumed.' It is surely illogical to assume that S. is following Homer and then show what S. means by adducing what H. means.

There is no comment on v. 639. But the word *όμαινε* should have been noticed. Creon assumes that no *όμαινος* of Jocasta is present save himself.

Ver. 889. Can it be maintained that the *Heracidae* shows Athens winning a reward which is truly a 'gain'? Is it not rather the fact that Alcmena at the close reveals all the qualities which

Athenians most detested in contemporary Spartans; and that, therefore, if a moral is to be drawn at all it is: 'Do not interfere with the judicial system of another state; if you do, you may win strange gratitude from those you befriend.'

Vers. 1056 ff. It seems impossible to believe that Jocasta speaks 'with a terrible self-control'—at least on her departure. *ἰοὺ ιού*, if not actually a scream, is certainly a loud cry.

Ver. 1086. To attribute 'mad exaltation' to Oedipus because of his speech about *Τύχη* and the Months seems a mistake. There is pride in the speech, perhaps, but not the Sin of Pride. Oedipus has simply fallen into one of those marvellous Sophoclean moods wherein there is nothing but a superb meditation upon the quality of mere Life itself. The misconception here leads to a corresponding error on v. 1110, where we read of 'the effort of the King to recover the exact balance of a sane mind'—surely a curious comment on his simple remark:

*εἰ χρή τι κάμε μὴ συναλλάξαντά πω,
πρέσβεις, σταθμάσθαι, τὸν βετῆρ' ὅραν δοκῶ,
ὄντερ πάλαις ἔγραψαν.*

The Indices should have been much fuller. There are a few misprints, mostly false accents. On p. 123 for 'Creon' read 'Cleon.' On p. xlix Mr. Sheppard has fallen into accidental verse: 'proverbial moralities are rooted in realities.'

This book was finished early in 1915 (p. xiv). It is a pity that it was therefore impossible for it to include any mention of a remarkable work which appeared in 1917, *Die dramatische Technik des Sophokles*, by Tycho von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, who was killed at the age of twenty-eight in the heavy fighting before Iwangorod. The book appears to be at present little known in this country, but it merits serious attention. This young scholar has brought forward a number of new and most interesting difficulties in the structure of the *Oedipus Tyrannus*—e.g. as regards the summoning of Tiresias and the long delay in sending for the eye-witness of Laïus' murder. His points, new or old, do not justify his conclusions; but they do remind us that a valuable piece of

work is waiting to be done—the examination of Sophocles' own notion of dramatic verisimilitude; in other words, the question: To what type of 'mistake'

is he indifferent? Here is material which we should be glad to see Mr. Sheppard handling in the second edition of his book.

GILBERT NORWOOD.

ERACLITO.

Eracleo: Nuovi Studi sull' Orfismo.
By VITTORIO MACCHIORO. Bari:
Laterza e Figli, 1922.

THE idea that some of the fragments of Heraclitus contain 'Orphic' doctrine is not entirely new, though it is not referred to in most recent writings on the philosopher. The present study makes out a case for this view which, if sometimes spoiled by over-statement and unconvincing in regard to some details, at least requires consideration. A large number of fragments of Heraclitus come from the sections of Hippolytus' *Confutation of All Heresies*, in which it is argued that the heresy of Noetus is a revival of Heracliteanism. These fragments in most modern editions of Heraclitus (though Diels is an exception) are not printed in the order in which Hippolytus cites them, but are scattered up and down the whole collection. Macchioro protests against this, and holds that Hippolytus had before him as he wrote an entire section of the original work of Heraclitus—the third (or 'theological') section of the three into which, Diogenes tells us, his work fell; and that from Hippolytus' treatment, and from the fragments, kept in order, the essence of Heraclitus' 'theological' doctrine can be recovered. His argument up to this point merits very careful attention. If it is sound (as it appears to be) it would appear that full use has not usually been made of an important source of information about Heraclitus, though Professor Burnet (*Early Gk. Phil.*, ed. iii., p. 142 n.) is careful to distinguish the value of Bk. IX. of Hippolytus as a source from that of Bk. I., which evidently used an epitome of the physical doctrines of the early philosophers. The question really turns on the interpretation of Hippol. IX., p. 448, 29, *ἐν δὲ τούτῳ τῷ κεφαλαίῳ πάντα ὄμοῦ τὸν ἰδίον νοῦν ἐξέθετο* (sc. Heraclitus); and, taken in their plain sense, these appear to support Macchioro's view.

Macchioro goes on to argue that the central thought of Heraclitus, which Hippolytus compared with that of the heresy of Noetus, can only have been that of the identity of the Divine Father and Son; that such an idea can only have been derived by Heraclitus from the myth of Zagreus, the Orphic 'sacred story'; and that this was closely connected in Heraclitus with a doctrine of the identity of opposites, which was really a philosophical expression of Orphic doctrine about death and life, palingenesis, etc. He also thinks that Hippolytus' treatment proves that the theory of *ἐκπύρωσις*—the periodical conflagration of the universe—was really Heraclitean, whereas most scholars have doubted or denied this (cf. Burnet, *l.c.* pp. 158 ff.). The idea that Orphic mysticism is at the back of Heraclitus' philosophy doubtless gives point to the epigram quoted by Diog. L. IX. 16, Μὴ ταχὺς Ἡρακλείτου ἐπ' ὄμφαλὸν εἴλεε βίβλον | τούφεσίου μάλα τοι δύσβατος ἀτραπίτος. ὁρφὴν καὶ σκότος ἔστιν ἀλάπετον. ήν δέ σε μύστης | εἰσαγάγη, φανερῷ λαμπρότερ' ἡελίου: and Macchioro explains some of the fragments without difficulty in accordance with his theory.¹ He also compares with the fragments and with Hippolytus a number of passages of Plutarch in which Orphic eschatology is set forth, and finds that the latter provide the key to the former.

It is impossible, in a brief review, to discuss the argument at length: parts of it appear to be sound, or at least to require an answer: but, perhaps owing to their strangeness, parts arouse a good deal of suspicion. Among the latter may be mentioned the interpretation of two fragments in which Macchioro finds traces of the Father and Son of the Zagreus story, viz. fr. 52 (Diels=79 Byw.) Αἰών παῖς ἔστι παῖξων πεσσεύων.

¹ E.g. fr. 62 (Diels=67 Byw.) ἀθάνατος θνητος, θνητοις ἀθάνατοι, ζῶντες τὸν ἐκείνων θάνατον, τὸν δὲ ἐκείνων βίον τεθνεώτες, and a number of others.

παιδὸς ἡ βασιληὴ, and fr. 53 (Diels=44 Byw.) Πόλεμος πάντων μὲν πατέρ
ἐστι, πάντων δὲ βασιλεὺς κτλ. The attempt to show that Αἴών was a name of Dionysus rests on a combination of very late passages, even if Dionysus in the legend was caught by the Titans while playing draughts, and was given the kingdom by Zeus after his resurrection. The second fragment is interpreted by identifying Πόλεμος with Zeus, in accordance with Chrysippus' remark (Diels, *Doxogr.* p. 548 b, 12), τὸν Πόλεμον καὶ τὸν Δία τὸν αὐτὸν εἶναι, καθάπερ καὶ τὸν Ἡράκλειτον λέγειν. There is an interesting discussion of the παλίντονος ἀρμονίη ὄκωστερ τόξον καὶ λύρης: and Macchioro denies that the Heraclitean references to Dionysiac processions and orgies are contemptuous, as is usually supposed. But these and many other points could only be discussed adequately in as many pages as the author's own. It is to be hoped that Professor Burnet, or some other scholar who has specialised on the early Greek philosophers, and above all in the necessary *Quellen-Kritik*, will undertake the task. A reviewer can do no more than state his conviction that

there is a case which is worth considering.

As regards the Orphic doctrine itself, the present volume adds little to the author's earlier studies. Readers of Dr. Farnell's treatment of the subject (*Greek Hero Cults*, ch. XIV.) will find some points of difference between the two writers, and can hardly fail to feel that Dr. Farnell's treatment of evidence is far more sober and convincing, and not really less imaginative; but Macchioro often raises interesting questions and discusses them well, in this and in his other works. As an illustration of the points of difference, I may refer to Macchioro's statement that the Orphic funeral rite was cremation, while Dr. Farnell says that the Orphics 'practised inhumation rather than cremation' (l.c. p. 378). (Unfortunately some of Macchioro's arguments are buried in periodicals which are very hard to procure in England.) Among the more interesting discussions is that of the meaning of *ληναιζεῖν* and kindred words (pp. 106 ff.)—a problem which seems never to have been solved in a way which satisfies everyone.

A. W. PICKARD-CAMBRIDGE.

PUBLIC LIBRARIES AND LITERARY CULTURE IN ANCIENT ROME.

Public Libraries and Literary Culture in Ancient Rome. By C. E. BOYD. One Vol. Pp. 77. University of Chicago Press, 1915.

THIS book deals with the equipment, the contents, and the management of libraries at Rome. It will not supersede Dzietzko's article in vol. III. of Pauly-Wissowa, since it covers only a portion of the field. The evidence for public libraries at Rome is on the whole pitifully meagre and disappointing. It is tempting (and Mr. Boyd does not always resist the temptation) to make the most of it in order to present as complete a picture as possible. Why, for instance, does he represent Horace's friend, the poet-plagiarist Celsus, as actually reading in the Palatine Library the works which he plagiarises? If, as seems probable, the Celsus referred to was the secretary to Tiberius, he was

rich enough to have his own books without resorting to a public library. All that Horace's advice amounts to is that his friend should not plagiarise from works that were famous enough to have obtained admission to the Palatine. Again, Mr. Boyd seems to infer that the public could borrow books from the public libraries, because Marcus Aurelius, in a letter to Fronto, speaks of having borrowed certain orations from the Palatine. But a librarian will always oblige an Emperor. As I read the passage it shows rather the difficulty of borrowing, since the Emperor proceeds playfully to recommend Fronto to try and borrow from the Tiberian librarian, but adds that a douceur will be necessary in order to get him to consent to the loan. The other passage on which Mr. Boyd relies will not help him. It is from Vopiscus' life of

Aurelian, and describes the offer of the city prefect, Tiberianus, to lend Vopiscus books from the Ulpian library. But Mr. Boyd ought not to cite this and other passages from the *Historia Augusta* without cautioning the reader that they cannot be taken at their face value. The research spent on this work since Dessau's pioneer article in 1889 has all gone to show that it is not a work of the age of Diocletian and Constantine, as it pretends to be, but is a product of nearly a century later. It may not be the complete swindle that some German critics have maintained it to be; but it is at best but a mosaic whose constituents are of very different value. And among the most doubtful statements is the preface to the life of Aurelian with its reference to *libri linteai*, and the life of Tacitus with its romantic story about the ivory book in the sixth *armarium* of the Ulpia. Justice is done to these statements in Pauly-Wissowa X. 1108 and E. Hohl, *Hermes* LV. 301.

Finally, I think the author is asking too much of his evidence when he concludes that 'the libraries of Rome were the chief means of preserving to medieval and modern times many works of antiquity.' But we have only to remember the condition in which Probus and Ammianus found the Roman libraries and that Rome was sacked three times in so short a period as 410-472. What has preserved the Latin Classics for us is not the Roman libraries, but the efforts of the pagan nobles of the Theodosian epoch—the 'anti-christian Fronde,' as they have been called. These men kept alive the ancient learning long enough for the Christian Church to recover its senses and breed up men of the type of Cassiodorus in the place of the early fanatics. But there is no reason to believe that the Symmachi and their circle were specially assisted by the libraries at Rome.

F. W. HALL.

DIE ENTSTEHUNG UND RELIGIÖSE BEDEUTUNG DES GRIECHISCHEN KALENDERS.

Die Entstehung und religiöse Bedeutung des Griechischen Kalenders. Von MARTIN P. NILSSON. One vol. Pp. 66. Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup. Leipzig: Otto Harrassowitz, 1918.

PROFESSOR NILSSON has published this section of an article on the Greek and Roman Calendar in its religious aspect, prepared for the Lexicon of Greek and Roman Religion. It supplements his valuable study, *Primitive Time-reckoning* (reviewed, *C.R.* XXXV. 31), which was undertaken as a preliminary to the investigation of the classical Calendars. Naturally this article contains much of the same material; but it is reduced to a shorter form, and only what is relevant to the Greek Calendar is included. The student will find here an admirably lucid exposition of the necessary astronomical elements, the meaning of 'synodic month,' 'heliacal rising,' etc. The Calendar itself was developed in the service of religion. A tolerable degree of correspondence with the natural year was effected only at a late stage when scientific astronomy

had freed itself from the priesthood. Even now it is not improbable that a counter-revolution in Russia would restore the pre-Gregorian Calendar. The whole development illustrates the extreme difficulty which the human mind experiences in disengaging natural facts capable of exact determination from preconceptions coloured by emotional values.

Professor Nilsson's familiarity with the primitive background enables him to pronounce with some probability of being right on a number of questions where the scholar who prides himself on his ignorance of barbarism is likely to go wrong. At the same time he is a master of the classical side of the subject, and his judgment is cautious.

From the study of the month it emerges that the festivals cluster thickly about the time of the full moon, especially on the twelfth day, which Hesiod (*Op.* 774) praises above all. The exception is the group of Apollo festivals on the seventh day, an exception so striking as to lead to the inference that Apollo

came to Greece from Asia Minor and brought thence the sacred number seven originally derived from Babylon. Professor Nilsson believes that the octaeteris is the oldest intercalary cycle; the penteteris and trieteris (except the Dionysiac trieteris) are subdivisions of it. The earliest evidence for the octaeteris is at Delphi; it probably spread from there. The necessary astronomical knowledge may have come from Babylon (which influenced Ionian

astronomy in the sixth century), though the octaeteris appears to have been put into actual use first by the Greeks. In *Primitive Time-reckoning* (1920), p. 364, Professor Nilsson rejects Mr. Fotheringham's explanation of the shifting of the Olympic games between the two months Apollonios and Parthenios (*J.H.S.* 39, 1919, 177).

This article may be recommended as a lucidly arranged and accurate account of the known facts.

F. M. C.

LA LOI DE HIÉRON ET LES ROMAINS.

La Loi de Hiéron et les Romains. Par JÉRÔME CARICOPINO. Pp. xxi + 307.

Paris: Fontemoing, 1914.

THE brilliant comparison by Rostovtsev (*Staatspacht, Philologus Suppl.* 9, 331) between the *Lex Hieronica* and the Revenue Laws of Ptolemy Philadelphus has seemed to the author a reason for a fresh study of Cic. *Verr. Act. II. 3 De Frumento* with a view to recovering one essential term of the comparison, the *Lex Hieronica* itself. This is a delicate matter, and ends in attributing to the Hieronic system some of the edicts with which Cicero reproaches Verres; but the writer is fully conscious of the difficulty, and equal to the delicacy of his task. We think that he has succeeded in extracting from Cicero the general principles of the *Lex Hieronica*, which he rightly attributes to Hiero II. He makes an interesting conjecture as to the origin of the whole system of tithes, which he believes to be older than the *Lex*, and he regards the extension of the *Lex* to the whole of Sicily as due to the Romans. There are excellent chapters on the further taxes, *frumentum emptum, aestimatum, and in cellam*; also one on the taxable subjects, which leads to new but solid conclusions about the number and status of the Sicilian *civitates* and about the *ager publicus*, in particular the puzzling *ager Leontinus*.

The crucial point in a system of tithes, farmed to *decumani* and payable to and by them in kind, is, as the author shows, the method of assessment upon and exaction from the individual *arator*. The system of the *Lex Hieronica* was,

according to him, as follows: assessment was by agreement (*pactiones*) arrived at in *areis* between *arator* and *decumanus*; in default of agreement, the local magistrates arbitrated; for excessive exaction there was an *actio in octuplum* against the *decumanus*, for deficient delivery an *actio in quadruplum* against the *arator*—actions which took place, unless the parties were of the same *civitas*, in the local forum of the defendant. Verres destroyed the equity of this system (1) by abolishing the arbitration of the local authorities, enacting in his first edict '*ut quod decumanus edidisset sibi dari oportere, id ab aratore magistratus Siculus exigere*' (13, 34), or '*quantum decumanus edidisset aratorem sibi decumae dare oportere, ut tantum arator decumano dare cogeretur*' (10, 25); (2) by thus securing that the *decumanus* would nearly always be defendant, and the forum at Syracuse under Verres' arrangements; (3) by edicting, as an extra precaution, '*ut arator quo vellet decumanus vadimonium promitteret*'; (4) by using criminal law to terrorise recalcitrant *aratores*.

M. Carcopino seems in this account to have arrived at the substantial truth, and incidentally his researches into the *conventus* have produced valuable results. But in his treatment of Verres' first edict there is matter for serious objection. That this edict deformed a Hieronic system of local arbitration is a conjecture, but a good one. That it amounted to an introduction of publican's *pignoris capio* in favour of the *decumanus* is a misapprehension, for the exaction was to be by the Sicilian

magistrates (13, 24), though doubtless Verres' *decumani* helped themselves, and, moreover, a case of *pignoris capio* does not arise. If I take the very thing which I say you owe me, that is not taking *pignus*. A true case of *pignoris capio* supposes that property—say, cattle—is seized as security for debt. The author himself cites (11, 27): 'Cum in omnibus aliis vectigalibus, *Asiae, Macedoniae, etc.*, . . . cum in his rebus omnibus publicanus petitor ac pignerator, non erector neque possessor soleat esse, tu de . . . aratoribus ea jura constituebas quae omnibus aliis essent contraria.' Precisely.

Pignoris capio was a Roman institution, a familiar weapon of the *publicanus* elsewhere. He thereby, as in our own law of distress (Pollock and Maitland, 2, 575), put pressure on his debtor, but he remained plaintiff. Verres gave the *decumanus* possession of his claim and made him defendant. The passage is a confirmation of the natural inference from Gaius 4, 32 as to the *formula* based on fiction of *pignoris capio*, and throws light on the very obscure *legis actio*. Apart from this point, we think that the author's conclusions will be generally accepted.

F. DE ZULUETA.

DIE HELLENISTISCHEN MYSTERIENRELIGIONEN.

Die Hellenistischen Mysterienreligionen.
By R. REITZENSTEIN. One vol. 8vo.
Pp. viii. + 268. Leipzig: Teubner,
1920.

THIS book is a second edition of Reitzenstein's lectures published first in 1910. Some pages of new material are added to the text, and still more to the notes, but the book remains substantially what it was. It forms the handiest summary of religion in the Hellenistic world that we possess, and bears witness on every page to a close knowledge of this fascinating subject.

The spread of Oriental ideas westward, and their fusion with Greek thought in the centuries immediately before and after the beginning of the Christian era, is a remarkable fact which has had a lasting influence on mankind. As the world became gradually a unity, and intercourse between its various parts increased, so the old local religions gave way, and in their place arose others of a more universal character, which aimed not at representing tribal or national ideals, but at satisfying the needs of the individual man. These religions were active and missionary. Prophets and wonder-workers, *θεῖοι ἀνθρώποι*, travelled through all lands, proclaiming their faith and founding communities for the worship of their god. The gods were many, in name and in cult, yet certain common ideas bore witness to an underlying unity. The mystery religions professed to hold a revelation, given long ago, the knowledge of which

brought men salvation. This knowledge was communicated mainly through initiations and visions. The recipient was united to his god, filled with the divine spirit, and thereby assured of immortality. Not only *γνῶσις* and *σωτηρία*, but *παλιγγενεσία*, *δόξα*, *φῶς* and *φωτίζειν*, *τέλειος*, *πνεῦμα* and *πνευματικός*, and other terms, familiar to us from the New Testament, were in common use and bore well-defined meanings in the mystery religions.

Our knowledge of these religions has been widened of late by the careful study of the Hermetic writings, in which Reitzenstein has taken a conspicuous part, and by the discovery of Papyri. Texts relating to Mandaeism and Manichaeism, two curious Oriental systems which exhibit many of the fundamental mystery ideas, are also included in Reitzenstein's survey. All these writings are of little value as literature: their interest is theological. They reveal a stage of religious thought, which may be regarded as standing midway between primitive ideas and Christian theology. More than a half of Reitzenstein's pages are concerned with St. Paul, if we include the two long notes on *γνῶσις* and *πνεῦμα* (pp. 135-185) and *Paulus als Pneumatiker* (pp. 185-244). He claims that St. Paul must have read the mystery literature and assimilated its ideas even before he founded the Greek churches; and that his language must be interpreted in the light of its known meaning in the mystery religions. A detailed

criticism of these contentions has already appeared in H. A. A. Kennedy's *St. Paul and the Mystery Religions*, but Reitzenstein does not mention this. Two difficulties are quickly apparent. (1) All St. Paul's terms can be found in the *Septuagint*, and it seems more reasonable to find the explanation of them in Jewish thought, if that is possible. (2) Much of the mystery literature is of uncertain date, and may possibly be itself affected by Christian teaching. There is also a further point. The ideas for which St. Paul is supposed to be indebted to the mystery religions form only a part of his teaching. His doctrine of the Cross, and all that was involved in it, was to the Greeks foolishness: to St. Paul it was central. If we removed altogether his speculations on the *σῶμα πνευματικόν*, it would not matter much. But remove his teaching about Redemption through the Cross, and most of his distinctiveness would be gone. As is well known, it was just this side of St. Paul's teaching which dropped out of sight after his death, because the Church of the second and third centuries could not assimilate it. This fact makes us suspect that the influence, such as it was, of the mystery religions on Christianity, came rather through St. Paul's Greek converts

than through any previous knowledge or sympathy on his part. They first translated the new religion into their own tongue in order to understand it, and St. Paul had to follow their practice, if he would make himself intelligible to them. Yet we cannot doubt that, in using the current terms, St. Paul was in no sense carried away by them. His creative genius enabled him to adopt them as vehicles for the expression of a faith and experience that was peculiarly his own. Even the visions on which his claim to be an Apostle was based, and the freedom from bondage to Jewish tradition which he secured for his Greek converts, both of which Reitzenstein traces confidently to Hellenistic sources, may well be ultimately due to the great prophets of Israel.

This book certainly deserves the close study of all who are interested in Christian origins and the history of religion generally. There is a tendency in English Theology to minimise the influence of Greek environment on the Early Church. Reitzenstein has at least proved that the similarities between Hellenistic and Christian religious thought were in certain directions more important and extensive than is sometimes believed.

G. W. BUTTERWORTH.

MARTIAL AND OTHER ESSAYS.

Martial the Epigrammatist and Other Essays. By KIRBY FLOWER SMITH, late Professor of Latin in the Johns Hopkins University. One vol. Octavo. Preface and Contents + pp. 172. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1920. \$2.

A FEW of the less technical papers of the late Professor Flower Smith have here been gathered by Professor W. P. Mustard into a memorial volume, welcome to many of his old students and associates, as well as to those who, like myself, enjoyed the privilege of correspondence with him. The papers are miscellaneous, and range in date from 1902 to 1918.

Professor Flower Smith was favourably known as an editor of *Tibullus*, and his scholarly interest in Graeco-

Roman elegy makes it appropriate that studies of Ovid and Propertius should follow the attractive paper on Martial from which the title is drawn. Incidentally, the much-discussed explanation of Ovid's exile is touched upon, and the suggestion made that, when women like Livia meddle in affairs of state, a man may be ruined for a very trifling offence, so that 'the chief reason why we have never discovered a sufficient and satisfactory cause for Ovid's banishment is because there really never was one.' This paradoxical conclusion is at least a possibility; but I question whether it is a safe and sound might-have-been to say that Ovid 'without doubt could have become a distinguished lawyer if he had cared to exert himself in that direction.' It always

seems to me that one of the most illuminating passages about Ovid's abilities is that of the elder Seneca to the effect that Ovid had a temperamental dislike for the *controversia* but a passion for the *suasoria*. His genius was in fact psychological, dramatic, and narrative: it was not ratiocinative, and in every estimate of his work Seneca's words should be taken into account.

The essay 'Pupula Duplex,' a comment on Ovid, *Amores I. viii. 15*, is reprinted from *Studies in Honor of B. L. Gildersleeve*, and examines in an entertaining way the superstitious beliefs in fascination associated with a 'double pupil' and eyes of different colours.

Occasionally and not unpleasantly one is reminded of the Transatlantic authorship of the volume by such illustrations intended for the American reader as the remark that Martial 'was

as proud of his Celtiberian strain as any Virginian could be of the blood of Pocahontas,' and though now and then Americanisms appear like 'first rows back of the orchestra' and 'clatter which never lets up,' still there is an explicit distrust of 'American briskness of speech' and a plea for sound English uttered with excellent taste in 'The Classics and Our Vernacular.' The next paper, on 'The Future Place of the Humanities in Education,' gives the author's considered judgment on the value of Latin and Greek with the lessons of the war behind him. The last paper, on 'Boyhood Reminiscences of a Country Town,' is non-classical; and a few verses, including a free translation of the *Copa*, close a volume which combines knowledge with good sense and humour.

J. WIGHT DUFF.

THE ALEXANDRA OF LYCOPHRON.

The Alexandra of Lycophron. With English translation and explanatory notes by GEORGE W. MOONEY, M.A. One vol. Crown 8vo. Pp. 178. London: G. Bell and Sons, 1921. 8s. 6d.

LYCOPHRON, the 'Obscure,' has a bad name among the students of Greek literature, and it would be an easy task to put together a collection of unfriendly criticism, beginning with the *latebras Lycophronis atri* of Statius (Stat. *Silv.* 5. 3. 157), and ending with the pained amazement of Mahaffy (Mahaffy, *Greek Life and Thought*, pp. 302-3).

To some extent, no doubt, the poet has been the victim of circumstances. We are credibly informed that he was a member of the Tragic Pleiad, and wrote not only a considerable number of tragedies, but even a so-called satyric drama, the *Menedemus*, with *dramatis personae* taken from contemporary life. Of all these works we have now only four short fragments from the *Menedemus*, and one from the *Pelopidae*, a tragedy.¹ We need not regret the loss of the tragedies, but that of the *Menedemus* is another matter; and the

skillful attempt of Mr. Tarn to recreate the circle of intellectuals at Eretria, for whom and about whom it was written, is tantalising in its incompleteness.²

For us, however, Lycophron is the author of the *Alexandra*, and by this curious composition, which its author probably wrote as a mere *πάπεργον*, Fate has decided that his reputation should stand or fall. Though the unfortunate poet might justly murmur against this arrangement of Providence, his shade ought to feel gratified at the amount of attention which his *tour de force* has received, albeit grudgingly, from subsequent generations. Preserved throughout antiquity as a work well calculated to sharpen the wits of Sixth Form boys,³ it provoked the ingenuity of Canter and Scaliger in the sixteenth century, and that of Bachmann in the early nineteenth. In the last fifty years particularly much has been done to illuminate the dark places of the *Alexandra*. E. Scheer (Vol. I., 1881; Vol. II., 1908) has laboured to establish the text,

¹ Nauck², *Trag. Gr. Fr.* pp. 817-8.

² Tarn, *Antigonos Gonatas*, pp. 22-5.

³ Comp. Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.* V. p. 676 P.

rain as a flood of
and then
it rows
clatter
is an
riskiness
English
in 'The
The
place of
' gives
ent on
with the
. The
sciences
classical;
the trans-
e which
l sense

UFF.

recreate
Eretria,
it was
complete-

is the
by this
author
īpēryōv,
putation
the un-
murmur
evidence,
at the
tour de
digging,
reserved
ark well
of Sixth
genuinity
xteenth
in the
ty years
alone to
the Alex-
Vol. II.,
the text,
rom. v.

while von Holzinger (Leipzig, 1895) and Ciaceri (Catania, 1901) have endeavoured to elucidate the subject-matter, besides producing translations in German and Italian respectively.

English scholars have not concerned themselves greatly with Lycophron, but we have the (for its age) respectable edition of Potter (Oxford, 1697, 1702) and the verse translation of Lord Royston (1806). These, however, are now out of date, and, in any case, neither of them is easy to procure; a new English edition is all the more welcome.

Professor Mooney has already shown his competence in Alexandrian scholarship by his edition of Apollonius Rhodius (1912). His Lycophron, though planned on a modest scale, is likely to be even more useful. The book contains a brief introduction and synopsis, Greek text, English translation (in blank verse) on the opposite page, and explanatory footnotes. There are also two useful indices.

In the introduction the editor collects the few facts which are handed down about Lycophron, but he does not attempt to discuss the vexed questions of the date of the *Alexandra* and of the authenticity of ll. 1226-1280 and ll. 1446-1450. Perhaps we ought to be thankful for this omission. He expressly renounces 'a minute examination of the language of the *Alexandra*', and no doubt the subject is a thorny one; but many people, though their taste may be arraigned as morbid, will find the chief 'attractiveness of the poem in its linguistic peculiarities—e.g. the artful 'interpretation' of Homer by the use of Homeric glosses, the employment of contemporary vulgarisms, or the proofs of the author's enforced perusal of Attic comedy.'

The text of the *Alexandra* does not offer great opportunities for conjecture. Scheer, who has done so much to clear up the tradition of the MSS., is rightly rebuked by Holzinger for his wilful alteration of the text in the interest of so-called uniformity of dialect. Professor Mooney, to judge by his practice, agrees with Holzinger (comp. l. 368 *τέφρην*, l. 665 *ἄγρην*, l. 1131 *κοῦρατ*, etc.). In one passage he has inserted a suggestion of his own, viz. :

'Ελλὰς στενάξει πᾶσα τὸς κενούς ταφούς,
οὐκ ὄστοθήκαις χοιράδων ἐφημένους.
(ll. 366-7).

χοιράδων δ' ἐφημένους (MSS.: Scheer)
οὐκ ὄστοθήκαις, χοιράδων δ' ἐφημένων.
(Holzinger).

Professor Mooney translates l. 367 as follows :

Not placed upon the reefs which hold their bones.

taking ἐφημένους with *τάφους*, and regarding *χοιράδων* as a genitive of 'material' after *όστοθήκαις*. This is no doubt possible Greek, but the sense thus obtained gives us an awkward contrast with ll. 368-9. Professor Platt¹ once suggested that a line had dropped out between *όστοθήκαις* and *χοιράδων* δέ.

In the commentary Professor Mooney is content to give an excellent résumé of the information collected by his predecessors, more particularly Holzinger. He has managed to include practically everything that is necessary for an understanding of the text, though the more subtle suggestions of modern scholars (e.g. at l. 154) find no place in his notes.

As regards the translation, he states that his aim has been 'to give the meaning of the Greek as clearly and simply as possible.' In this he has succeeded admirably, and anyone who has ever attempted to translate Lycophron will admit that this alone is no mean achievement. His version may lack the 'billowy roll and roar' of Lord Royston's translation (I quote the description of Mr. Gosse), but it will be of far greater assistance to the student. Much of the *Alexandra* is geography put into iambics, but it is interesting to note how the magic of Greek proper names helps out the baldest passages. Take, for example, ll. 644-6 in Professor Mooney's version :

Sprung from old Arne they, Boeotian chiefs,
Yearning for Graea, Leontarne's hills,
Scolus, Tegyra, and Onchestus' site,
Thermon's torrent, and Hypsarnus' streams.

Lycophron will certainly never be a 'school author' again; but Professor Mooney's edition ought to tempt some of our riper scholars to make the acquaintance of the *Alexandra*.

E. A. BARBER.

¹ *Journ. of Phil.* 39, p. 114.

GERMANISCHE URGESCHICHTE.

Die germanische Urgeschichte in Tacitus' Germania. By EDWARD NORDEN. One volume. Large 8vo. Pp. x+505. Leipzig-Berlin, 1921.

THE famous crux in the second chapter of the *Germania* has vexed commentators from the fifteenth century onwards, and, as is computed, has given rise to at least twenty-five different interpretations or conjectures; but Norden is dissatisfied with the purely philological discussion of the passage, and has devoted a volume of more than 500 pages to a new method of attacking the problem. His guiding motive is the view that Tacitus' mode of expression conforms to the fixed type of ancient ethnographical writing, and he therefore finds it necessary to survey this field of literature, beginning with Hippocrates' *περὶ ἀέρων ὕδατων τόπων*. It is not difficult to show that the concepts with which ancient ethnography operates are of Greek origin; nor is it to be disputed that Posidonius applied the method in describing the peoples of the West, and that amongst these he named the Germans, a fact which, in view of Athenaeus' perfectly definite statement, should never have been doubted. But this is not enough to satisfy Norden. We are asked to accept two further propositions: firstly, that wherever Tacitus (or for that matter Caesar) betrays an acquaintance with ideas first expressed by Greek writers, Posidonius may be assumed as the ultimate source; secondly, that Tacitus would never have read Posidonius' work for himself, since 'there is no great Roman writer who holds himself so aloof from everything Greek as Tacitus' (p. 143). These propositions need far more proof than is given in Norden's book. That Caesar consulted Posidonius' *History* is likely enough; but some of the arguments adduced by Norden give slender support to the conclusion. Caesar, in introducing his famous digression on the manners and customs of Gaul and Germany, remarks (as he could hardly help doing) that it will be pertinent to set forth *quo differentia hae nationes inter se*; and a few chapters later he uses the expres-

sion *Germani multum ab hac consuetudine differant*. This, says Norden, is a 'remarkable agreement' with a passage in the Hippocratic *περὶ ἀέρων*, where the author sets out to treat of Asia and Europe, *όκόσον διαφέρουσιν ἀλλήλων*, and adds that he will speak only *περὶ τῶν πλεῖστον διαφερόντων* (not *πλείστων*, as Norden prints it). 'Evidently,' says Norden (p. 100), 'it is a traditional commonplace of ethnographical literature, this portrayal of the *διαφέροντα* of countries and peoples, which we meet with again in Caesar. For Caesar, Posidonius alone can be considered as the transmitter.' Surely Caesar had no occasion to dredge Posidonius for commonplaces! But this is not all. Posidonius had 'the distinction (no mean one) of appearing, though unnamed, on the threshold of the most famous memoirs of antiquity.' How was this? Because Caesar's famous opening sentence, *Gallia omnis . . .*, 'betrays his knowledge of the technical language of Greek ethnography: we have just read Posidonius' words, *ἡ σύμπασα Γαλατία*.' Tacitus, it will be remembered, begins his work with the words *Germania omnis . . .*; and many critics have seen in this an imitation of Caesar: but this will not satisfy Norden. For Tacitus mentions rivers and mountains in the context, which Caesar does not; therefore the source is rather to be sought in a similar phrase in Pliny's *Natural History*!

That Tacitus could not or would not read Posidonius for himself there is no real attempt to prove; nor will Norden allow that he consulted Timagenes, whom he regards as an intermediary between Posidonius-Caesar and Livy. Yet he quotes Quintilian in order to show that Timagenes' reputation was at its height in the Flavian period (p. 153). It must be confessed that, in spite of many ingenious *rapprochements*, the whole series of arguments by which Norden seeks to trace the course of the Posidonian stream in all its branches is lacking in cumulative effect.

The chapters which deal with the elder Pliny's *Bella Germaniae* as a source

of Tacitus are of greater value. Here Norden corrects the extravagances of the view that the *Germania* is 'a collection of excerpts from the *Bella*', pointing out very truly that between the reign of Claudius and that of Trajan there had been a considerable increase in the material available, for example in the writings of civil officials, officers, and merchants. 'From this wealth of material,' says Norden, 'Tacitus, in pursuance of his habitual method, which may be observed in the historical works also, selects a small portion and works it up into a new whole' (p. 263). This is true enough; but the effect is somewhat neutralised by the assertion on the next page that statements of historical fact (other than those which concern events later than Pliny's period, such as the Chatti wars of Domitian) 'must have been drawn immediately from the *Bella* of Pliny, since this was the only source which enters into consideration.' Surely this is going too far: Norden himself allows (p. 211) that the *Bella* were not the principal source used by Tacitus in the First Book of the *Annals*, where they are only casually quoted in cap. 69. Nor can it be allowed that the use of phrases such as 'manet adhuc,' 'hodieque,' and the like, is an indication that Pliny is the source. Such turns of expression are common in Tacitus—a collection of instances will be found on p. 273, note 1; and unless it can be shown that the statements involve anachronisms, there is no reason to assume that they are borrowed. In the *Annals* (II. 88) Tacitus tells us that Arminius *canitur adhuc barbaras apud gentes*, and this is claimed by Münzer (whose view is accepted by Norden) as a proof that Pliny, who wrote within a generation of Arminius' death, is the authority.

But this highly rhetorical passage is surely Tacitus' own composition; and it is hard to say that there are anachronisms in the *Germania*, though Norden suggests that the preference shown by the barbarians for *serrati* and *bigati* points to Pliny's time rather than to that of Tacitus. It is, of course, true that Pliny's career of service took him to the Rhine frontier; Münzer has made it very probable that in 47 A.D. he served under Corbulo in Lower Germany, and in 50-51 A.D. under Pomponius Secundus in the Upper Province; and it is very possible that Tacitus was indebted to him for information in several cases. But we should surely bear in mind that Tacitus' father was *procurator Belgicae*, and that it is not at all unlikely that the historian himself held a command in the same region in 89-93 A.D.—facts which would suffice to account for the knowledge displayed in the *Germania*, and, indeed, may have inspired the composition of the treatise.

Although Norden falls into the common error of *Quellenkritiker*, and seeks to prove too much (in spite of his protest that is not a *Namenjäger* on p. 58), his very discursive book is full of matter of which no summary can be given here, and is well worth reading. We are especially glad to note that he has not ignored the work of at least one English scholar. Of Mr. Rice Holmes' *Caesar's Conquest of Gaul* he thrice uses the epithet *genau* (pp. 357, note 2; 377, note 3; 399, note 4), and this is not a word which he uses lightly. His interpretation of the vexed passage which forms his text (*Germ.* 2. 5) is based on the assumption that Greek modes of expression are implied: the first *a*, he thinks, represents *ἀπό*, the second *ὑπό*.

H. STUART JONES.

A GREAT INHERITANCE.

New Studies of a Great Inheritance. By Professor R. S. CONWAY, Litt.D. One volume. Pp. viii+241. 8" x 5". London: John Murray, 1921. 7s. 6d. THIS collection of essays is mainly a republication of lectures delivered at various times during the last twenty years, the development of some of

which is traced in footnotes. Though in the last essay on 'Education and Freedom' the inheritance is extended so as to cover Classical Literature as a whole, it is the Latin writers of the Great Age, and more especially Virgil, who are the theme of Dr. Conway. Few Latinists have done more than

he to bring home to students of the Classics how much of our wealth of ideas on the intercourse of man with man, of the government of subject races, of sane imperialism, we owe to Horace, Livy, and Virgil. The essay on 'Horace as Poet-Laureate' gives a fresh answer to those who reproach the writer of the Odes for being commonplace, because he first gave poetic expression to the very views which they have derived from him. The essay on the 'Inner Experience of Cicero' shows how the orator's use of *ego* and *nos* in his correspondence may be treated as a political barometer: 'By counting the occurrences of the Plural of Dignity in the letters we can ascertain just how often he was moved to complacency by the thought of his various distinctions, his learning, eloquence, possessions, or political achievements.' The essay on 'Man and Nature in the Augustan Poets' paints in lurid colours the state of the Roman world in the first century B.C., and indicates how nature was treated by the poets in compensation for the deplorable conditions of politics and society, bringing balm to the philosophic Lucretius by its methodical regularity, encouraging Horace and Tibullus by the fertility and quiet of country, whether actual or Utopian, but with really serious inspiration for one poet alone, Virgil, whose 'transcending process' made the toils and pains of everyday majestic by linking them with great mysteries, and beautiful by interweaving them with human affection. The authorship of the poems in the *Appendix Vergiliana* is discussed in 'The Youth of Virgil.' Dr. Conway goes with Skutsch, and against Drachmann and Professor Rand. While ready to admit the *Culex* as an early work of Virgil, he accepts as conclusive the evidence that Gallus was the author of the *Ciris*, an authorship which in some way mitigates the regret we might feel for the early demise of that unfortunate official, which is the subject of a separate essay. To the metrical points of evidence for non-Virgilian authorship collected by Dr. Conway in a footnote on p. 77 may be added the fourteen spondaic endings, as against

none in the *Culex*, and the complete hexametrical endings in the fourth foot (*adductisque labascunt* and *multoque cruentas*) found again in the Eighth and Twelfth *Aeneids*, but not in his early writings. Dr. Conway will carry his readers with him in most of his views in the essay on the 'Growth of the Underworld,' though they may think it overfanciful to suppose that the carvings of Cretan history, as indicating the Minoan Age, would suggest 'how vast was that majority of the human race now passed into the darkness which the book is to explore,' or that the thought of Daedalus' mourning for his son would suggest the '*filial* affection, which is the motive of the hero's journey.'

It is in the essay on the 'Classical Elements in Shakespeare's *Tempest*' that there is most to excite disagreement. The verbal resemblances to Virgil seems largely accidental, and in no way comparable to the clear derivation of the passage 'Ye elves of hills, brooks, and standing lakes and groves' (quoted on p. 168) from Arthur Golding's translation of Ovid's *Metamorphoses*. In an earlier essay Dr. Conway has already suggested (p. 53) as probable the derivation of 'this my hand will rather the multitudinous seas incarnadine,' from Horace's 'quod mare Dauniae non decoloravere caedes?' where the resemblance is not very close. Still less readily can we believe in a view of the universe consciously derived from Virgil by Shakespeare, despite the vast sympathy common to both poets. Dr. Conway's suggested reasons for the pagan atmosphere in which the play is set deserve attention. But a different explanation would have to be given for *Twelfth Night*, which may be taken as another example of romantic comedy (by a curious slip on p. 174 Dr. Conway describes *Romeo and Juliet* as an early comedy). I believe I am right in saying that in the blank verse of *Twelfth Night* there is no use of the singular 'God,' though Antonio speaks of 'the gentleness of all the gods,' and there are fairly frequent allusions to Classical mythology. Biblical allusions are confined to the prose of Sir Toby Belch and his associates; Sir Andrew Ague-

cheek speaks of God both in English and French, and the Clown, who 'lives by the Church,' more frequently. Malvolio, the Puritan, swears by Jove

when he is pleased with life, but when in distress makes his appeal 'By the Lord.'

A. S. OWEN.

MANUEL D'ARCHÉOLOGIE ROMAINE.

Manuel d'Archéologie Romaine. Par R. CAGNAT et VICTOR CHAPOT. Tome second. Two vols. Octavo. Pp. vi + 574. 331 half tone and line blocks in the text. Paris: Auguste Picard, 82, Rue Bonaparte, 1920. Fr. 30.

THIS is the second and concluding part of a work which appears to be planned as a continuation of the invaluable series of archaeological manuals by the late M. Déchelette. Part I. appeared in 1916, and contained one of the most complete and detailed studies of Roman architecture that has ever been written, together with a shorter but equally readable account of Roman sculpture and plastic decoration. We now signalise the appearance of volume two, the opening chapters of which complete the study of the 'Décoration des Monuments' by a discussion of painting and mosaic work. While the sections on technique are admirably clear and to the point, the chapters on the repertory of the artists are too long for the pages of a manual; they are over-detailed for the ordinary student, and yet do not replace such catalogues as that of Helbig for the specialist. The illustrations are excellently chosen, but might have been better reproduced.

The remainder of the volume deals with the 'Instruments de la Vie publique et privée' in a series of chapters devoted to religion, theatre and games,

agriculture and industry, weights and measures, carriages, shipping, military equipment, costume and toilet, furniture, household utensils, lighting, games, music, writing, and medicine. The work does not pretend to be an account of Roman life; it ignores literary evidence, save in explanation of museum objects, and hence the book contains some curious gaps. For instance, the section on war contains no word on organisation or tactics, but is devoted entirely to details of equipment, and that only for the Imperial period, the legions of the Republic and of Julius Caesar being passed over as having left no adequate archaeological remains. It is a pity that, as illustrations of ancient artillery, the clumsy models made half a century ago for Napoleon III. have been selected instead of the more modern reconstructions of Schramm. The best and most enlightening sections are those on dress and music. Under the heading of household utensils is concealed a brief but excellent account of Roman pottery. Altogether, as a reasoned survey of the mass of material available in museums for the reconstruction of Roman life, the book is to be strongly recommended; but it is surely time that the cut-up bedstead of Fig. 610 disappeared from textbooks as an illustration of a Roman chair of state.

F. N. PRYCE.

SHORT NOTICES

Grieksch Woordenboek. Door Dr. F. MULLER JZN. Groningen, den Haag: J. B. Wolters. Fl. 13.90.

THIS handy Greek-Dutch Lexicon in 1,248 small octavo pages deserves praise for its attempt to include the new material supplied by papyri (literary and non-literary) and (to a lesser extent) by inscriptions. No one would expect

completeness (or anything like it) in such a work. At the same time the author's selection of words for inclusion does not seem based on any very intelligible principles. He cites the *Ichneutae* of Sophocles fairly frequently; yet (to take the beginning of the alphabet) we do not find such words as *αιόλισμα*, *ἄκεστρον*, *ἄλκασμα*, *ἀνανοστέω*

and ἀποθυμαίνω in their places. Several interesting dialect forms from inscriptions are included (e.g. ἔταλον = *vitulus*); but ἄρρεντερος (opp. θηλύτερος) and the like are absent. We are glad to note that ὀδών is correctly given as the only early form of the Greek word for 'tooth,' but we might have been told that it occurs in Herodotus and Hippocrates.

The author caters for the junior student, and excludes post-Polybian Greek in general (save for the New Testament, Plutarch, and Lucian) from his purview. Under these circumstances he might well have jettisoned some of the more technical terms from the vocabulary of the papyri. H. S. J.

Papers of the British School at Rome.
Vol. IX.

THIS volume is, as the Director puts it, 'an earnest of the renewed activity which the School hopes to be able to display' under post-war conditions. If it contains somewhat fewer articles of interest to the readers of the *Classical Review* than most of its predecessors, it is noteworthy by reason of a new feature. After the articles sponsored by the Faculty of Archaeology, History, and Letters (which include a further instalment of Mr. R. Gardner's account of the road-system in Central Italy, and a bibliographical study of the engravings of ancient statues in Rome published in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, by Dr. Ashby), there appears, under the aegis of the Faculty of Architecture, a restoration of ancient Praeneste by Mr. H. C. Bradshaw, formerly Rome Scholar in Architecture. This is a remarkable piece of work, not only beautifully drawn, but based on careful study and measurement of the extant remains, and hence of real archaeological value. It amply justifies the institution of the Architectural Faculty with its 'Prix de Rome.' H. S. J.

A Study in the Commerce of Latium from the Early Iron Age through the Sixth Century B.C. By LOUISE E. W. ADAMS, Ph.D. Pp. 84. Northampton, Mass.: Smith College Classical Studies, 1921.

A QUITE admirable summary of the evidence for the intercourse of Latium with the outside world up to the end of the Regal Period at

Rome, based on a careful study of a vast number of publications. Miss Adams holds that in the Early Iron Age—the period of pit graves—while foreign traders sold their wares in Etruria, Latium remained almost untouched. The Phoenicians did not undertake perilous journeys 'for the sake of goats' milk cheese.' In the seventh century, however, foreign goods reached Latium along the land route from Etruria to Campania, which passed through Praeneste, at this date a more important place than Rome, where nothing has been discovered comparable to the contents of the Bernardini and Barbarini tombs. Later, when Rome was ruled by Etruscan kings, foreign influences increased, and an attempt was made, possibly by the treaty with Gabii, to divert the land route so as to make it pass through the city. But the treaty with Carthage of 509 B.C. shows that even at the end of the sixth century Rome had not developed into a really commercial power. All the same, Greek goods had reached Rome in considerable quantities in the Regal Period; and 'when the Romans rediscover the Greek world in the Hellenistic age, they do not realise that they are returning to their old teachers.'

G. H. S.

Athenian Political Commissions. By FREDERICK D. SMITH. Pp. 81. University of Chicago Libraries, 1920.

THIS dissertation consists of a study of the various fifth-century bodies described as *συγραφεῖς*, *ἀναγραφεῖς*, and the like. About two-thirds of it is concerned with the constitutional changes of the years 411-410, and 404-403 B.C. Mr. Smith has mastered the voluminous literature of the subject, and shows good judgment in his use of it. It is to be regretted that English students of ancient history are not required to produce a piece of work of this character as part of their degree course. Mr. Smith should avoid such forms as *σιτώφιλακες*, *θεοροι*, and *Nichomachus*; and why does he always speak of a *συγγραφαι*?

G. H. S.

Notes on the Greek Anthology. By T. W. LUMB, M.A. (Oxon.), Assistant-Master at Merchant Taylors' School, E.C. One volume. Small octavo. Pp. 168. London: Rivingtons, 34, King Street, Covent Garden, 1920. 7s. 6d.

MR. LUMB'S *Notes on the Greek Anthology* will be welcomed by all lovers, and readers, of the *Anthology*, whose numbers are probably increasing despite Mr. Lumb's apparent doubts. Fresh efforts at translation are constantly being made, and we may fairly hope that some who feel the charm of the epigrams even at second hand will be lured on to a study of the original text. Scholars will find these notes an in-

a vast
as holds
od of pit
ir wares
touched.
perilous
cheese.'
n goods
te from
through
nt place
covered
rnardini
ome was
fluences
possibly
the land
the city.
C. shows
y Rome
mmercial
reached
e Regal
over the
y do not
their old
H. S.

dispensable companion—a sort of lucky bag into which to dip for enjoyment and useful suggestion. Sixth-form masters will find the book a very handy means of initiating their more brilliant pupils into the art and science of textual emendation. It consists of a series of some five hundred suggestions for the emendation of the text, not only where the MSS. is obviously corrupt, but also where a reasonable change will improve a line which clearly fails to do its author justice, and the weakness of which is, as likely as not, due to a careless copyist. There is a fine quality of taste as well as of scholarship informing the whole work. A few examples will best indicate its scope. Take Meleager's well-known description of Eros in A.P. V. 178 (Mackail's *Select Epigrams*, i. 52). The fifth line runs:

πρὸς δὲ έτι λαιπόν ἀτρεπτὸν δεῖλαλον οὖν δεδορκές.

FREDERICK
of the
as συγ-
ut two-
tutional
103 B.C.
s litera-
dgment
that
are not
of this
e. Mr.
pulakes,
does he
H. S.

λαιπόν is weak, as Mr. Lumb says, and he claims that Meleager is too economical to use four words to express 'besides.' Mr. Mackail notes the redundancy as a colloquial one, and contents himself with referring to the Latin *nec non etiam*. But Mr. Lumb happily suggests that the true rendering is *πρὸς δὲ έτι ἀλτρόν*, the latter being used of Eros in V. 188-5, and as an illustration of the confusion between *π* and *τρ* he quotes the *τραῦμα* for *πνεῦμα* in V. 197. Less acceptable perhaps, as less necessary for the full meaning of the epigram, is his suggestion to read *αὐτοθελῆς* for *ώς έθέλεις* in the last line of A.P. VI. 30 (Mackail ii. 7), Macedonius' *Old Fisherman to Poseidon*. Mr. Mackail ends the previous line with a comma, and connects *ώς έθέλεις* directly with *μεδέων*, 'O ruler of both earth and sea as thou wilt.' Mr. Lumb says 'there should be some reference to the will or power of the god, not of the man.' But is there not, even if we leave *ώς έθέλεις* alone? Equally caustic and happy is the note on A.P. IX. 169. 5, 6, Palladas on *The Uselessness of Teaching*:

δᾶλ' ίν' ἀδαρτάζη Βρισηΐδα πρίν 'Αγαμέμνων
τὴν 'Ελένην δὲ ἡ Πάρις πτωχότεύω γενόμην.

Palladas' scansion, says Mr. Lumb, is certainly weak, but if he wrote *πρίν*, he certainly deserved to be a poverty-stricken lecturer (in a country, we may

add, where no Burnham scale obtained). He probably wrote *Βρισηΐδ' ἀβρήν*.

Besides the notes on the *Anthology* the book submits a series of emendations of the Tragic and Epic Fragments (Ed. Wagner, *Didot*).

J. G. L.

L.-A. CONSTANS: *Gigthis. Étude d'Histoire et d'Archéologie sur un Emporium de la Petite Syrie : avec 14 planches hors texte et 3 figures dans le texte.* (Extrait des Nouvelles Archives des Missions Scientifiques. 14^e fasc.). Pp. 113. Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1916.

GIGTHIS in Tunis, discovered by V. Guérin in 1860, excavated by Reinach and Babelon (1884), and later by Gauckler and Sadoux (1901-1906), is of interest, not because of its importance in history—its history is lost to us—but as an example of a provincial town which grew prosperous under the Pax Romana of the Empire. Originally a Punic settlement, it is never mentioned in literature, save in the *Periplus* of Scylax and the Roman *itineraria*. From its inscriptions we learn that it was raised to the rank of a *municipium* by Antoninus Pius; it later acquired the *Latium maius*, while in the third century of our era its municipal aristocracy entered the Roman Senate, held Roman magistracies, and were even given provincial governorships. Gigthis furnishes us with another example of those provincial fora of which several have been excavated in recent years. It is not yet certain to whom the great temple in the forum was dedicated: one might have expected to see in it a *Capitolium*, a temple of Jupiter, Juno and Minerva. M. Constans, however, concludes that it was dedicated to the divinities of Alexandria in view of the discovery on the right of the temple of a fine head of Zeus Sarapis; but he has not convinced M. Cagnat (cf. *Journal des Savants*, N.S. XV. [1917], pp. 289-299). The task of the excavator is rendered more difficult by the fact that a Byzantine restoration used the materials of earlier buildings and thus caused much confusion on the site. The market-place of Gigthis was originally

(second century) constructed with rectangular porticoes, but when rebuilt in the third century the interior court was surrounded by a portico which terminated in a semicircle. M. Cagnat has suggested that this change may have been general in the towns of Roman Africa in the third century.

The student has every reason to be grateful to M. Constans; it is only on careful monographs such as this that the comparative study of the development of provincial towns under the Empire can be securely based.

N. H. B.

S. KOPERBERG: *Polybii Historiarum Liber XXX quoad fieri potuit restitutus*. Dissertation. Pp. 99. Amsterdam: Campis apud J. H. Kok, 1919.

BELOCH recently expressed the view that an attempt must be made to reconstruct, so far as possible, the lost books of Polybius; the author of this dissertation has made that attempt for the thirtieth book. For this purpose the text of Diodorus is printed by the side of Livy's account and the parallel passages from Plutarch (*Life of Aemilius Paulus*) are added to the 'excerpta' from the text of Polybius which have been preserved to us. Points of special difficulty are discussed in an appendix, where the author gives reasons for his contention that Plutarch did not consult Polybius directly, but drew his Polybian material from some intermediary source. The dissertation should be of real service to students of Polybius. N. H. B.

Auguralia und Verwandtes. By EDWIN FLINCK. Crown octavo. Pp. 74. Helsingfors: Drucherei der Finnischen Litteratur-Gesellschaft, 1921.

THIS is an interesting pamphlet, and contains many suggestions worth consideration on rather obscure points connected with Roman augury. Dr. Flinck expresses his dissatisfaction on philological grounds with the traditional derivation of *augur* from *avis* and *geo* (*quia per avium gestus edicitur Festus*), and prefers to derive the word from the

root of *augere*, seen also in the cognate adjective *augustus*. So far there is nothing new, for this connexion is suggested in antiquity and has been supported by modern philologists. Dr. Flinck's contribution is a careful analysis of the augur's functions, in which he shows that his only duty at the taking of the auspices (by the magistrate) was one of interpretation, and that the *augurium* is not, like the *auspicium*, an observation of omens to see what will occur, but a direct prayer for blessing to be answered by a sign. It was only later when *auspex* and *augur* were confused in practice that similarity of derivation was insisted on, and popular modern ideas have perpetuated the confusion. This is a valuable point. Dr. Flinck goes on to show that the augur was originally connected with fertility (cf. the *augurium canarium* and *auguria vernisera*), and especially with fruit-trees, and among them particularly with the vine. Here his evidence becomes slighter, and it is even precarious when he proceeds to derive *vindex* from *vinum* ('the man who knows about the vine-staff'), and then to claim that the augur's *litius* was a staff of the same kind as the *vindicta* with which he blessed (*litare*) the fruit-trees. Once launched on fruit-trees Dr. Flinck becomes almost reckless: *strenae* are the twigs of fruit-trees given as presents for luck, for which small coins were subsequently substituted; *stips* is the same (if *stipula* is a wisp of straw, he argues, *stips* is a larger thing like it—i.e. a twig), and if you ask why there are two words with the same meaning and the same history, it is because *strena* is Sabine, and *stips* is Latin. All this is hazardous, and Dr. Flinck's logic is shaky. A proposition once established as 'wahrscheinlich' becomes the premise of the next syllogism, and so on. Nevertheless, this second part of the thesis is valuable too as calling attention to the religious significance of the fruit-tree (*arbor felix*) in Roman thought—a point frequently overlooked.

C. BAILEY.

CORRESPONDENCE

To the Editor of THE CLASSICAL REVIEW.

DEAR SIR,

Professor Conway and his work command my affectionate admiration, but when he takes Professor Butler to task for speaking of the 'Fourth *Georgic*', it becomes a duty to protest. He supports his criticism by a factious analogy, a baseless statement, and what after deliberation I must interpret as a jest.

When he speaks of 'Aristotle's Third *Ethic*' as a parallel expression to the 'Fourth *Georgic*', the only reply is that educated people, not slovenly of speech, habitually use the one expression, while no one uses the other. There is no more to be said. Next the Professor asserts that to use the name *Georgic* in the singular robs it of part of its meaning. In one sense only is this true: a *Georgic* means one quarter

of the *Georgics*. Lastly, when he fancies that 'schoolboys' are left to connect the name subconsciously with the Hanoverian dynasty, I can only suppose that he is being pleasant with us. Well and good, but by implication this 'Hanoverian theory' arises from the singular use of the word. Come, come, Professor!

The fact is, we all speak of the 'Fourth *Georgic*', the 'Sixth *Aeneid*', the 'First *Iliad*', and never dream of asking for authority. But if literary authority is required, we can have it. The writers quoted in Murray's Dictionary as using the singular form, *Georgic*, are those two purists Joseph Addison and Thomas Gray. Can Professor Conway find half so good pedigree for his *Vergil*?

Yours faithfully,
A. L. IRVINE.

Charterhouse, Godalming.

SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS

PHILOLOGISCHE WOCHENSCHRIFT.
(OCTOBER—DECEMBER, 1921.)

GREEK LITERATURE.—W. A. Kosten, *Inquiritur quid Xenophontis Δακεδαιμονίων πολιτεία valeat ad Lacedaemoniorum instituta cognoscenda* [Diss. inaug. Rheno-Traiect., 1921] (Gemoll). Much material collected, but the work as a whole is not a success.

LATIN LITERATURE.—A. Kurfess, *Sallusti Crispī epistulae ad Caesarem senem de re publica* [Leipzig, 1921, Teubner. M. 2 + 120%] (Levy). Welcome and reliable edition based on Hauler's collation of *Vaticanus* (Wien. Stud. 17); useful indices.—G. Thörnell, *Studia Tertulliana, II.* [Uppsala, 1921, Akad. Bocktryckeri] (Tolkiehn). Marks an advance in the criticism and exegesis of Tertullian as well as in the knowledge of his peculiar language.—C. Giarratano, *Q. Asconii Pediani commentarii* [Rome, 1920] (Klotz). Thoroughly useful edition.—W. Rinkefeil, *De annotationibus super Lucanum* [Diss. Greifswald. Dresden, 1917, Raming] (Hosius). Methodical and on the whole convincing investigation of the second body of *Lucan* scholia.—W. A. Merrill, *Notes on the Silvae of Statius, Books I.-IV.* [University of California Publications, Vol. V., 1918-1920] (Hosius). Superficial. Reviewer criticises several passages.—G. Janell, *P. Vergili Maronis opera. Post Ribbeckium tertium recogn. Editio maior* [Leipzig, 1920, Teubner] (Güthling). Eradicates Ribbeck's wild conjectures and on the whole successfully restores the true text; cannot be overlooked by those specially interested in *Vergil*.—Alice H. Byrne, *Titus Pomponius Atticus. Chapters of Biography* [Diss. Bryn Mawr, Pennsylvania, 1920] (Klotz). Failure to draw a living portrait of Atticus is largely due to the insufficient material.—V. Ussani, *Rutilii Claudi*

Namatiani de redditu suo libri II. [Florence, 1921, Perrella. L. 6] (Levy). Contains introduction, text, critical notes, and index, but leaves room for another edition. V. Wiesner, *Donatiana. Die Interpretationes Vergilianae des Ti. Claudius Donatus sprachlich untersucht* [Diss. Würzburg. Bamberg, 1920, Kirsch] (Hofmann). W., a pupil of Stangl, is a thoroughly competent late Latin scholar; his excellent chapter on the text is carefully discussed by reviewer.—Gladys Martin, *Laus Pisonis* [Cornell University, 1917] (Hosius). Deals with the anonymous *Panegyricus* in *Pisonem*; tradition and personalities discussed clearly and soberly; sensible and sufficient notes form the most valuable portion of the work.

HISTORY AND INSTITUTIONS.—J. de Decker, *De Grieksche en Romeinsche Oudheden en de Philosophie der Geschiedenis* [Gent, 1918, de Veirman] (Kraemer). Reviewer gives very full account of D.'s academic address, and agrees with most of his argument.—A. Heisenberg, *Aus der Geschichte und Literatur der Palaiologenzeit* [Sitz.-Ber. d. Bayer. Akad. d. Wiss. München, 1920, Franz] (Wellhofer). Admirable treatment of a number of difficult Byzantine questions; in particular, much new light is thrown on court-ceremonial.—W. J. Snellman, *De interpretibus Romanorum deinceps linguae latinae cum aliis nationibus commercio. Pars I.: Enarratio; Pars II.: Testimonia veterum* [Leipzig, 1914-1919, Dieterich. M. 10 each part] (Hofmann). Part II. is a valuable collection of all ancient evidence on the cultural relations between Rome and her subject peoples; Part I. seeks to explain the material collected, but is little more than a mere paraphrase, faulty both in language and in interpretation.—W. E. Caldwell, *Hellenic Conceptions of Peace* [Studies edited by the Faculty of Political Science of

Columbia University. New York, 1919] (Hofmann). Though often sketchy, this clear and sober survey may be read with profit; the influence of economic conditions on peace and war is stressed.—H. Bier, *De saltatione pantomimorum* [Diss. Bonn, 1920] (Bethe). Finds origin of pantomimic art and music in Egypt. Reviewer agrees that practically every pantomimic actor came from the East, especially Egypt; but there is not enough evidence to trace the origins definitely, as B. does, to the cult of Isis.—J. J. B. Mulder, *Quaestiones nonnullae ad Atheniensium matrimonia vitamque coniugalem pertinentes* [Utrecht, 1920] (Tittel). Handy survey of marriage at Athens in classical times; extensive material industriously collected, and all important questions discussed with sound judgment.—W. Weber, *Josephus und Vespasian* [Berlin, 1921, Kohlhammer. M. 50] (Laqueur). Though reviewer rejects W.'s main theory, yet he welcomes the book for its many helpful suggestions; they must, however, be used with caution.—R. Vagts, *Aphrodisias in Karien. Die geschichtliche Entwicklung der Stadt, ihre künstlerische und literarische Bedeutung, ihre Verfassung und Verwaltung in römischer Kaiserzeit* [Diss. Hamburg, 1920] (Bilabel). Deserves thanks for his industrious compilation, though it contains nothing new of real importance.—F. Bilabel, *Die ionische Kolonisation* [Philologus, Suppl.-Bd. XIV. 1. Leipzig, 1920, Dieterich] (Lincke). Valuable preliminary studies for a general account of Greek colonisation; B. makes full use of epigraphical and archaeological evidence on the relations between the mother-cities and their colonies; careful index.

PHILOSOPHY.—E. Bignone, *Il pensiero Greco, Vol. X., Empedocle. Studio critico, traduzione e commento delle testimonianze e dei frammenti* [Turin, 1916, Bocca. L. 15+] (Philippson). Shows astounding range of knowledge in building up his case for Empedocles' Dualism; notes contain many new readings and interpretations; valuable appendices.—H. Barth, *Die Seele in der Philosophie Platons* [Tübingen, 1921, Mohr. M. 24] (Leisegang). B. works from a preconceived point of view, and thus entirely destroys the spirit of the original.—G. Kafka, *Die Vorokratiker* [München, 1921, Reinhardt. M. 15] (Nestle). Forms the first of forty volumes, which are to include the whole of philosophy from earliest to modern times; pre-Socratic systems clearly developed and subjected to penetrating criticism; bibliography, and notes with references to original authorities.—F. Boll, *Vita Contemplativa* [Sitz. Ber. d. Heidelb. Akad. d. Wiss. Heidelberg, 1920, Winter. M. 4+] (Leisegang). Discussion of exact meaning of the words *θεωρίας* and *contemplativa* is followed by an attractive description of Greek thinkers as types of the *βλος θεωρίας*.

RELIGION.—W. Rist, *Die Opfer des römischen Heeres* [Diss. Tübingen, 1920, Laupp] (Weinreich). Useful as a careful collection of

material, but should be further developed, especially in its bearing upon the history of Roman religion.—E. Bickel, *Der altrömische Gottesbegriff* [Leipzig, 1921, Teubner. M. 5+] (Wissowa). B.'s edifice collapses as soon as its Varronian foundation is shown to be insufficient; yet there remains in the ruin useful material for rebuilding.—M. Ninck, *Die Bedeutung des Wassers im Kult und Leben der Alten* [Leipzig, 1921, Dieterich] (Roscher). Covers only a portion of the vast field, but is stimulating and achieves excellent results, especially in the first section on the chthonic nature of water.—K. Beth, *Einführung in die vergleichende Religionsgeschichte* [Leipzig, 1920, Teubner. M. 2+] (Ostheide). Warmly recommended; the chapter on the relations between God and man (prayer, sacrifice, taboo, etc.) is particularly noteworthy.

ARCHAEOLOGY.—H. Th. Bossert, *Altcrete, Kunst und Kunstgewerbe im ägäischen Kulturkreise* [Berlin, 1921, Wasmuth. M. 120] (Behn). Reviewer warmly praises the 215 full-page plates illustrating monuments of Cretan and Mycenaean art grouped according to kind (architecture, sculpture, fresco painting, ceramics, etc.); text comparatively unimportant.—C. Praschniker, *Muzakia und Malakastron* [Jahreshefte d. Österreich. Archäol. Instituts, Bd. XXI./XXII. Wien, 1920, Holder. M. 60. 131 illustrations] (Pagenstecher, +Aug. 1921). P. presents, in the form of a second report on excavations at Apollonia, etc., a large amount of new material important chiefly for the light it throws on cultural relations between Magna Graecia and Western Greece. Reviewer emphasises close similarity of Apollonian grave-stelae with Syracusan and Tarentine work.—W. Jänecke, *Die ursprüngliche Gestalt des Tropaeon von Adamklissi* [Heidelberg, 1919, Winter] (Dörpfeld). J. sets out to prove that the inner and outer parts of this Roman triumphal monument in Roumania belong to different periods. Reviewer thinks the controversy can be settled only by excavation.—J. T. Allen, *The Key to the Reconstruction of the Fifth-Century Theatre at Athens, and The Greek Theatre of the Fifth Century before Christ* [University of California Publications, Vols. V. and VII. Berkeley, 1918 and 1920] (Dörpfeld). The 'key' lies in the tangential relation of certain lines in the stage buildings to an inner and outer circle in the orchestra. D. claims that A.'s observations go far to prove theory of a wooden proscenium (no stage) immediately behind the orchestra.

LINGUISTIC.—F. Sommer, *Vergleichende Syntax der Schulsprachen (Deutsch, Englisch, Französisch, Griechisch, Lateinisch)* [Leipzig, 1921, Teubner. M. 10 + 120%] (Köhl). Most valuable, stimulating, and instructive; indispensable to teachers of languages. Reviewer adds suggestions.—H. Gerdau, *Der Kampf ums Dasein im Leben der Sprache* [Hamburg, 1921, Gente. M. 3] (Hermann). G.'s originality is stimulating, but reviewer

disagrees entirely with his theories.—K. H. Meyer, *Slavische und Indogermanische Intonation* [Heidelberg, 1920, Winter] (Hermann). Marks a real advance in our knowledge of Indo-Germanic accent; includes Greek and Latin; M. seems to prove that acute and circumflex in 'Ur'-Indo-Germanic were not restricted to final syllables.—F. Sommer, *lateinische Schulgrammatik mit sprachwissenschaftlichen Anmerkungen* [Frankfurt, 1920, Diesterweg] (Müller-Graupa). A first-rate book; arrangement good, skilful choice of parallels from other languages; will be most welcome to teachers who have not had a philological training.

PALAEOGRAPHY.—J. Bick, *Die Schreiber der Wiener griechischen Handschriften* [Wien, Prag, Leipzig, 1920. M. 600. 52 plates] (Gardthausen). As splendid work.—C. Wendel, *Die griechischen Handschriften der Provinz Sachsen* [Leipzig, 1920, Hiersemann] (Gardthausen). W. deserves our gratitude for his self-sacrificing work.

CLASSICS IN EDUCATION.—W. Jaeger, *Humanismus und Jugendbildung* [Berlin, 1921, Weidmann. M. 3] (Helck). J. considers Classics 'the kernel of European education.' Reviewer praises warmly his clear judgment and depth of thought.—F. Boll, *Sinn und Wert der humanistischen Bildung in der Gegenwart* [Heidelberg, 1921, Winter. M. 3+] (Helck). B. insists that Classics must be treated in a more living way in school teaching; compares German with American and English experiences; penetrating and deep.—A. Dresdner, R. Gaede, O. Wichmann, *Neues Leben im alt sprachlichen Unterricht. Drei Preisarbeiten* [Berlin, 1918, Weidmann. M. 6] (Ziehen). Very stimulating; importance of wide reading, of covering ground by help of translations, of reading aloud, and many other questions discussed in the light of the authors' own experience.—R. Meister, *Der Bildungswert der Antike und der Einheitsschulgedanke* [Graz, 1920. Bezug durch Buchdruckerei J. Zellmayer, Wien. M. 5 + 150%] (Becher). Includes chapters on the educational value and object of classical teaching and on the opposition to it; deserves warm thanks.

CLASSICAL WEEKLY (NEW YORK). (1921.)

ANTIQUITIES.—Oct. 17. H. Diels, *Antike Technik*, Ed. 2 (M. W. Humphreys). Praised: the work deals with all branches of Greek engineering, machinery, and chemistry.—Oct. 24. J. T. Allen, *Greek Theater of the Fifth Century B.C.* (D. M. Robinson). 'An admirable and sane discussion': the author seems to have made a new discovery as to the theatre-buildings at Athens.—Nov. 14. F. Poulsen (trans. by G. C. Richards), *Delphi* (D. M. Robinson). 'Full of most fascinating and suggestive observations on Greek art.' Reviewer discusses many details at length.—Nov. 28. J. R. Crawford, *De Bruma et Brumalibus Festis* (H. W.

Wright). A convincing discussion of the origins of a Byzantine festival.—Dec. 5. J. Hambidge, *Dynamic Symmetry: the Greek Vase* (T. L. Shear). An application of mathematical principles to the analysis and interpretation of Greek design. H. T. Bossert, *Alt Kreta* (A. D. Fraser). Nearly 300 beautiful illustrations, published with an adequate introduction at a relatively low price.

BIOGRAPHY.—Oct. 3. I. M. Linforth, *Solon the Athenian* (W. S. Ferguson). A life of Solon, with an edition of his poetic fragments: scientific, but lacking in constructive imagination: sceptical of all information not derived ultimately from the poems.—Dec. 5. Alice H. Byrne, *Titus Pomponius Atticus* (W. D. Gray). 'Has contributed many valuable ideas and observations.'

LITERATURE.—Oct. 31. A. Gudeman, *P. Cornelii Taciti Germania* (B. L. Ullman). Reviewer discusses the alterations from the American edition introduced into this (German) one.

RELIGION.—Nov. 28. E. W. Hopkins, *History of Religions* (C. H. Moore). Praises the chapters on Greek and Roman religion.

SYNTAX.—May 16. G. J. Laing, *The Genitive of Value in Latin* (A. L. Wheeler). 'Opens up a wide field.' Reviewer argues at length for the origin of the construction from the genitive of quality or description.

The issues of Nov. 28 and Dec. 12 contain lists of articles on classical subjects in non-classical periodicals.

LE MUSÉE BELGE.

(APRIL, 1921.)

AUTHORS.—Aristotle: P. d'Héronville has observations on the exactness of A. as a naturalist.

INSCRIPTIONS.—Greek: P. Graudor contributes Part II. of *Kykladica*, the first part of which appeared in *Mus. Belg.*, 1914, pp. 97 ff. From Tenos come three; from Ios one (early Ptolemaic), and several pre-Hellenic antiquities; several from Ceos; he gives a detailed account of the Acropolis of Karthaia, with the temples and pottery; an inscription *στοιχηδόν* from Poissa, of the latter half of the fourth century B.C., and a section on the *Συνοικισμός* of the cities of Ceos. The rare word *ἐγέβων* appears in an inscription of the third century B.C.—Latin: J. P. Walzing continues his articles on Latin Inscriptions in Roman Belgium: two funerary inscriptions and one dedication. The Celtic name Ocosunius appears to be a variant of Cosunius, known from the same district (Luxembourg).

LEXICOGRAPHICAL.—E. Merchie writes on the use of *Simia* as a masculine noun.

STYLISTIC.—*The Cursus in Greek*. A contribution to its bibliography, by L. Laurand; references are given to books and articles on the *Clausulae* in Classical authors, in the later Sophistic, and in Byzantine authors.

BOOKS RECEIVED

All publications which have a bearing on Classical Studies will be entered in this list if they are sent for review. The price should in all cases be stated.
 * * Excerpts or Extracts from Periodicals and Collections will not be included unless they are also published separately.

Bailey (C.) *Aristophanes: The Clouds.* 7 $\frac{1}{2}$ " x 5". Pp. 134. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1921. Cloth, 3s. 6d. net.

Baldwin (J. M.) *Le Média et l'Immédiat.* 9" x 5 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Pp. xii + 324. Paris: Librairie Félix Alcan, 1921. Fr. 20 net.

Bechtel (F.) *Die griechischen Dialekte.* Pp. vi + 478. 9 $\frac{1}{2}$ " x 6 $\frac{1}{4}$ ". Berlin: Weidmann, 1921. M. 78.

Boissonnade (P.) *Le Travail dans l'Europe chrétienne au Moyen Age.* 9" x 5 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Pp. ii + 430. Paris: Librairie Félix Alcan, 1921. Fr. 18 net.

Buscher (E.) *Greek Vase Painting.* Pp. xii + 180. 10 $\frac{1}{4}$ " x 6 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". London: Chatto and Windus, 1921. Cloth, 25s. net.

Carpenter (R.) *The Esthetic Basis of Greek Art.* Pp. viii + 264. 7" x 4". Pennsylvania: Bryn Mawr Coll., 1921. \$1.50.

England (E. B.) *The Laws of Plato.* Vol. I. Pp. x + 642. Vol. II. Pp. vi + 670. 7 $\frac{1}{2}$ " x 4 $\frac{3}{4}$ ". London: Longmans Green, 1921. Cloth, 10s. net each.

Farnell (L. R.) *Greek Hero Cults and Ideas of Immortality.* Pp. xvi + 434. 9" x 5 $\frac{3}{4}$ ". Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1921. Cloth, 18s. net.

Fränkel (H.) *Die Homerischen Gleichnisse.* 10" x 6 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Pp. iv + 120. Göttingen: Danzenhofer und Ruprecht, 1921. 4s.

Graves (C. L.) *New Times and Old Rhymes.* 8" x 5 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Pp. 128. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1921. Half cloth, 6s. net.

Heath (Sir Thomas) *A History of Greek Mathematics.* Vol. I. Pp. xvi + 446. Vol. II. Pp. xii + 586. 9" x 5 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1921. Cloth, 50s. net.

Heinemann (Fritz.) *Plotin: Forschungen über die plotinische Frage, etc.* Pp. xxiv + 318. 10" x 6 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Leipzig: Felix Meiner, 1921. 10s.

Ilberg (Professor Dr. J.) *Aus einer verlorenen Handschrift der Tardae passiones des Caelius Aurelianus.* 10" x 7". Pp. 819-830. Leipzig: W. de Gruyter, 1921. M. 0.50.

Jespersen (Professor O.) *Language: Its Nature, Development, and Origin.* 9" x 5 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Pp. 448. London: George Allen and Unwin, 1922. Cloth, 18s. net.

Kiessling (A.) *Q. Horatius Flaccus.* Pp. xlvi + 348. 8 $\frac{1}{2}$ " x 5 $\frac{1}{4}$ ". Berlin: Weidmann, 1921. M. 24.

Kosten (W. A.) *Xenophon's Politeia as Evidence of Lacedaemonian Institutions.* Thesis for Doctorate. Pp. xvi + 128. 8 $\frac{3}{4}$ " x 5 $\frac{3}{4}$ ".

Leaf (W.) *Little Poems from the Greek.* 8" x 5 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Pp. 94. London: Grant Richards, 1922. Cloth, 5s. net.

Livingstone (R. W.) *The Legacy of Greece.* Pp. xii + 424. 7 $\frac{1}{2}$ " x 5". Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1921. Cloth, 7s. 6d. net.

Löfstedt (E.) *Zur Sprache Tertullians.* 10" x 6 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Pp. viii + 118. Leipzig: Otto Harrassowitz, 1921.

Maas (P.) *Die neuen Responsionsprechen bei Bakhylydes und Pindar.* 9 $\frac{1}{2}$ " x 6 $\frac{1}{4}$ ". Pp. 22. Berlin: Weidmann, 1921. M. 16.

Meister (K.) *Die Homerische Kunstsprache.* Pp. viii + 262. 11 $\frac{1}{2}$ " x 7 $\frac{3}{4}$ ". Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1921. M. 180 (4s).

Meuli (K.) *Odyssee und Argonautica.* Pp. 122. 8 $\frac{3}{4}$ " x 5 $\frac{3}{4}$ ". Berlin: Weidmann, 1921. M. 16.

More (P. E.) *The Religion of Plato.* 8 $\frac{1}{2}$ " x 5 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Pp. xiv + 352. Princeton: University Press, Oxford: University Press, 1921. Cloth, \$2.50.

Naylor (H. D.) *Horace: Odes and Epodes.* 9" x 6". Pp. xxxii + 276. Cambridge: University Press, 1922. 20s. net.

Perrotat (C.) *William Wycherley.* (Sa Vie, Son Oeuvre.) 10" x 6 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Pp. 468. Paris: Librairie Félix Alcan, 1921. Fr. 20.

Plotinus. *The Ethical Treatises, translated by Stephen Mackenna.* Vol. II. Pp. viii + 158. 11 $\frac{1}{4}$ " x 8". London: P. Lee Warner, 1921. Cloth, 16s. net.

Powell (J. U.) and *Barber* (E. A.) *New Chapters in the History of Greek Literature.* Pp. xii + 166. 9" x 5 $\frac{3}{4}$ ". Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1921. Cloth, 10s. 6d. net.

Rennie (W.) *Demosthenis Orationes.* II. ii. 7 $\frac{3}{4}$ " x 5 $\frac{3}{4}$ ". Chapters XXVII.-XL. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1921. 3s. 6d. net.

Salonius (A. H.) *Die Ursachen der Geschlechtsverschiedenheit von dies.* 9 $\frac{1}{2}$ " x 6 $\frac{1}{4}$ ". Pp. 32. Helsingfors: Centraltryckeri, 1921.

The Journal of Roman Studies. Vol. IX, Part II. 11" x 7 $\frac{3}{4}$ ". Pp. 111-240. London: The Society for the Promotion of Roman Studies, 1919.

The Loeb Classical Library: Allinson (F. G.) *Menander.* Pp. xxxii + 540. *White* (H. G. E.) *Ausonius.* Pp. vi + 368. *Smith* (C. F.) *Thucydides.* Vol. III. Pp. vi + 376. *Harmon* (A. M.) *Lucian.* Vol. III. Pp. vi + 492. 6 $\frac{1}{4}$ " x 4 $\frac{1}{4}$ ". *Mair* (A. W.) *Callimachus and Lycophron, and Mair* (G. R.) *Aratus.* One volume. Pp. viii + 644. London: William Heinemann, 1921. Cloth, 10s. net each.

Tromp (S. P. C.) *De Romanorum Piaculis. Dissertation for Doctorate.* 6 $\frac{1}{2}$ " x 9 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Pp. viii + 160. Leyden: G. F. Theonville, 1921.

University of Illinois Studies in Language and Literature. Vol. VI., No. 2, Part I. Pp. 168. No. 3, Part II. Pp. 169-338. 11" x 7". Illinois: The University, 1920. \$1.50 each.

Ure (P. N.) *The Origin of Tyranny.* 9 $\frac{1}{2}$ " x 6". Pp. xii + 374. Cambridge: University Press, 1922. Cloth, 35s. net.

e sent for
published

5. 10" x
Harras-

recheten
14" x 64".
M. 16.

tsprache.
: B. G.

Pp. 122.
M. 16.
12" x 53".
ty Press.
Cloth,

Epodes.
e : Uni-

(Sa Vie,
Paris :

lated by
viii + 158.
er, 1921.

) New
terature.
larendon

, II. ii.
Oxford :

ler Ge-
9½ x 6½.
ri, 1921.
ol. IX,
London:
Roman

(F. G.)
(H. G. E.)
(C. F.)
5. Har-
vi. + 492.
hus and
us. One
William
ach.

Piaculis.
" x 9½".
eenville,

anguage
Part I.
169-338.
, 1920.

9½" x 6".
ty Press,